
Which Translation Should You *Trust*?

A Defense Of The Authorized King James Version Of 1611
Introduction and Chapter I

by
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright © 1993, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations (except where indicated) are from the
Authorized King James Bible

NOTE: The printed version of this book is available from **Morton Publications, 2101 Morton Road, Sutton, WV 26601** under the same title. It contains 75 pages, and is \$3.00 each postage paid. The complete HTML version (PDF format also available) is available on disk (along with three of the author's other books) for 5.00. For questions, comments, or more information email the author [Timothy S. Morton](mailto:Timothy.S.Morton) or write to the address above.

Contents

CHAPTER I WHY ALL THE CONFUSION?

What Saith The Scriptures? Is It A Matter Of Opinion? The Basis Of This Book

INTRODUCTION

In days past purchasing a Bible was simple. All a person had to do was go to a store that sold them, find one the size he wanted and with a cover he liked, and pay for it; he then had his own copy of the word of God. The buyer did not have to choose which version he wanted because for all practical purposes only one was available—the *Authorized King James Version* of 1611. In those days when a person said "Bible" everyone knew he was referring to the *King James Version*. Today, however, this simple task has become much more complicated. In the last one hundred years (especially the last thirty), publishers have bombarded Christians with dozens of new translations, each claiming to be superior to the *King James Version*. All of these new

"Bibles" on the market leave many Christians (especially new converts) in a dilemma. They do not know which one to get. They want to get the best one or the right one, but which is it? A conversation between a new Christian and a salesman in a modern Christian bookstore could go like the following:

"Can I help you sir?"

"Yes, I have recently gotten saved and would like to buy a Bible."

"Very well sir. We have just received another shipment of one of the newest translations, *The New International Version*. It is highly recommended by Bible scholars the world over. It is translated from the oldest and best Hebrew and Greek texts and is much more accurate than the older versions." He hands him one.

The Christian opens it, reads a few lines, and thinks to himself: "This doesn't read like the Bible I was led to Christ with."

The salesman continues, "Also, we have *The New American Standard Version* which many claim to be the most accurate, and we still have the old *American Standard Version* which some prefer."

The salesman turns and points to the shelves full of Bibles behind him and continues, "Here is *The New Revised Standard Version* which is recommended by many of the leading denominations. It's a recent revision of the old *Revised Standard Version* which is still popular. Plus, we have *The New Century Version*, *The Good News Bible*, *The Living Bible*, *The Amplified Bible*, *The New King James Version*, *The New English Bible*, *The New American Bible*, *The New Jerusalem Bible* and also *Phillip's*, *Weymouth's*, *Goodspeed's*, and *Moffat's* New Testament translations. In addition, we have special study Bibles by *Scofield*, *Dake*, *Bullinger*, *Thompson*, *Rice*, *Zodhiates*, *Willmington*, *Ryrie*, and others which help explain the intent of the original languages."

The Christian looks at the mass of Bibles and is bewildered. He finally says: "Do you have a Bible that says: **`Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved?'**" He emphasizes **"thou shalt."**

The man replies: "Well sir, you must be referring to the OLD *King James Version*. It was a good translation in its day, but it contains several errors; it also has many archaic words in it that are hard to understand. This has all been corrected in these new versions. For serious Bible study we recommend one of the new versions, but if you want the old *King James* we do have it."

The Christian thinks, "I did not realize there were so many different Bibles; I always thought there was only one. How can I know which one of these is the best? Can they all be the word of God if they are different? Is the *King James Version* I was led to Christ with plagued with errors? I don't know what to do." He flips through the pages of the *NIV* the salesman showed him first and says: "Well, if the old *King James* is not the best...I guess I will take one of these others...."

Scenes similar to this happen hundreds of times every year. They occur not only in bookstores, but also in homes, places of work, and even in churches. The desire for God's word has led many Christians into a complex maze of *advertising*, *salesmanship*, *scholarship*, and *opinion* which often leaves them confused. Confusion is a state God is not the author of (I Corinthians 14:33). He wants every believer to have His pure word and KNOW he has it!

In most churches in America there is no written, *final authority*—no Bible which is the absolute, FINAL authority for ALL matters of faith and practice. Because of this, one may see a wide variety of Bible versions brought by the members of these churches to a service. Some may bring an *NIV* to read while others bring an *ASV* or *NASV*. Still others may prefer the *NEB*, *RSV*, *NCV*, *NKJV*, or any other version as their "favorite" translation. And as if this is not enough "diversity," during the service they may hear the pastor appeal to yet *another* translation (maybe even his OWN). Some ministers use several different versions in a single message. What a recipe for confusion! All of these versions conflict with each other in thousands of places, and compared with the *King James*, many of the differences affect MAJOR DOCTRINES. This flood of modern, contradicting "translations" has made it so that the average Christian today has no standard Bible to consult as his final authority. All he has is a "reliable" translation which he "PREFERS," but he does not even prefer it in every passage. One person may prefer version A in one passage and version B in another, while another will prefer just the opposite! What a tragedy. Has the word of God become subject to the whimsical preferences of worldly, carnal, egocentric Christians? Many treat it as if it has.

Is it God's will that the Christian world be flooded with so many different English translations? If not, how can a person know which one is the infallible word of God? How can he know which version (or versions) is God's pure word; the one which contains the very words God wants him to have? These very questions puzzled the author until God opened his eyes to the truth of the matter. This book is an attempt to help others who may be in the same dilemma. Our purpose is not to give the many evidences that indicate God wrote a Bible (there are many good books on this subject), but to deal with the more relevant matter: *does this Bible exist in pure form TODAY?* Before we go any farther let the reader understand, God's pure, inerrant, infallible word IS ON THIS EARTH and He wants YOU to have it (Psalm 119:130)!

CHAPTER I

WHY ALL THE CONFUSION?

The issues concerning the Bible, its authority, origin, reliability, passage through history, and present form are issues man has debated for millennia. Nearly every person in history who thought himself knowledgeable had a definite opinion about the word of God and these many opinions varied greatly. Of those who professed "religion," some thought "God's word" was not made up of words at all but of only general ideas or concepts. Others claimed God did speak words to man, but insisted His words were mixed with "Jewish fables" or otherwise corrupted and "The Church" must sort them out for him. Still others believed His words were originally "given by inspiration" and written down, but since then they have been "lost" because the original manuscripts have not survived the centuries and errors have crept into their copies making them imperfect. And then there were those who believed they had the very words and every word God wanted them to have. Each of these beliefs is represented today, but which one is right? They can't all be. Furthermore, what brought about these conflicting ideas to start with? Where can one look to find the truth? For the answer, why not consider the book the Lord Jesus Christ read (Luke 4:17), studied (Luke 4:16) taught from (Luke 24:27), commanded others to study (John 5:39), and the words He said would never pass away (Matthew 24:35)—the Holy Bible?

What Saith The Scriptures?

To find what the scriptures say about these matters one does not have to go more than three chapters into the book of Genesis. It is not by accident the subject of God's word and how it is treated by different individuals is found at the very beginning of the scriptures. God wants man to learn before he reads in them any farther that there are forces at work who question His word and attempt to corrupt it. This is clearly seen in Genesis chapters two and three where God is found *speaking WORDS* to man (2:16), man *hears* these words spoken (2:16-17), and then someone QUESTIONS whether God really said them (3:1)! Here we are introduced to the first Bible revisor—Satan (Revelation 12:9). Clearly he has great interest in the what God says, not because he loves His words, but because he knows they are the words of *life* (John 6:63)—the words that deliver captives from his kingdom (1 Peter 1:23).

In Genesis 2:17 God was warning Adam of a danger in the garden which he could not have discovered himself until it was too late, that is, DEATH. God did not want Adam dead, but Satan did, and Satan knew he would have to destroy Adam's, or at least Eve's, confidence in God's word to bring his death about. The method he used to do this worked very well for him, thus he still uses it today; He simply QUESTIONS

whether God actually said what He said (Genesis 3:1 "**Yea hath God said**"). His questioning led Eve to SUBTRACT from God's word, therefore corrupting it (Genesis 3:2, "**freely**" is subtracted, see 2:16), and it also led her to ADD to His word, further corrupting it (Genesis 3:3, "**neither shall ye touch it**").

Once Satan has a person doubting God's word, he has him making himself the final authority for his life instead of God ("**ye shall be as gods**"). Casting doubt is the Devil's specialty. He knows that every lost person he can keep in doubt concerning the Bible will not be saved, and that every saved person he can get to doubt or question it in some area will not fully be what God wants him to be. He easily persuades millions in this manner to trust their own opinion over God's. It is imperative we remember this. The powers behind all the doubt and confusion we have today concerning the word of God are much more powerful than the powers of Madison Avenue or of mere book publishers; they are "**spiritual**" powers in "**high places**" which are motivated by "**wickedness**" (Ephesians 6:12). The Serpent's behavior in Eden proves the realm of God's word is Satan's primary interest. His foremost objective is to *question, dilute, deny, corrupt, or mock* God's word in the mind of every person so that person will not learn any of the precious truths found in it. If he had his way there would be no pure word of God anywhere on earth, but, praise His name, the God of Heaven, who is infinitely more powerful than Satan, has promised to preserve His word for all generations.

Another thing one must remember about Satan is that he counterfeits or imitates nearly everything God does. He has his own *apostles* (2 Corinthians 11:13-15), *prophets* (2 Peter 2:1), *messiah* (John 5:43), *trinity* (Revelation 13), *bride* (Revelation 17), as well as his own *Bibles*. Something many people seem to forget is, if all translations of the Bible are the word of God as many claim, then where are the Devil's? Did he lose interest in the word since Genesis 3? Has he quit corrupting it (2 Corinthians 2:17)? Is he afraid to influence revision committees? No, on all three counts. The Devil will be attempting to corrupt the word of God until the day he is cast into the lake of fire.

Is It A Matter Of Opinion?

The subtlety of Satan is clearly seen in the way he has affected the mentality of Christians in this century. He has convinced millions there is no infallible Bible on earth today by insisting only the *original manuscripts* were "**given by inspiration.**" To get them to swallow this fallacy, first he reminds them that all the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts which still exist are only copies, and then he insists they therefore *must* contain errors, making them inferior to the originals. This explains why many scholars speak the way they do in their books and commentaries. They say things like: "The most ancient and reliable texts tell us..." or "The oldest and best texts

read...." Why can't they say: "The infallible Bible says..." or "The pure word of God tells us..." and produce their authority? They can't because they do not have a pure and infallible Bible. The only "Bible" these "experts" have is a collection of what they call "reliable manuscripts" (which according to them can only be *uninspired* copies), and their reliability is based solely upon the "whim and fancy" of each individual's opinion. This leaves them with no *final authority* at all except their OPINION of what they THINK the originals USED to say! They will not hesitate, however, to "correct" the *King James Version* every time this authority (opinion) tells them to.

The Devil is playing an intellectual trick on scholars. He uses false logic and reasoning (like he did with Eve) to assure them that since the original manuscripts no longer exist the inspiration they were given by no longer exists either. That is, God's inerrant word vanished with the autographs. If one follows this reasoning, it would be IMPOSSIBLE for anyone in any language to have a pure, infallible Bible. Since all existing manuscripts are copies, and "copies cannot be inspired," no person anywhere could read (or hear) God's pure word. **"Yea hath God said."** Satan has not changed his tactics in six thousand years. He got Eve to doubt God by convincing her that HER OPINION of the tree was of MORE VALUE than God's, and he gets Christians today to doubt Him by telling them that since the "originals" are gone, they must TRUST the OPINIONS of scholars to provide them with a Bible that is "reliable," but by no means inerrant. Satan learned very early that man values his opinion above nearly everything else, and he will not hesitate to use this egoism against him.

In view of this, it is interesting to observe that when most fundamentalist preachers preach about the Bible they insist it IS *inspired, infallible, inerrant, the perfect word* of God, etc., and wave the Bible they are using (usually a *KJV*) as though they are referring to it. However, when questioning them closely one will find they actually believe the *opposite*. Like their mentors above, they do not believe ANY translation is perfect or inerrant and talk like it is impossible for one to be. When forced to say what they mean when they speak of an infallible Bible one will usually reply with something like: "Well, ONLY the original manuscripts were inspired and they no longer exist, but through the labors of highly trained scholars and godly men we have translations today which are accurate and reliable...." That is, he does not have an infallible Bible, he only has one that is (relatively) "accurate and reliable." In light of this, how can he PROVE that ANY version (or the text behind it) is the best when he admits his final authority no longer exists? Likewise, how can he PROVE the *King James Version* (and its text) is not the best? He cannot prove either. He has been pulled into Satan's "no perfect translation" hoax and exalts his favorite scholar's opinion (or his own) as his final authority even when it robs him of an inerrant Bible.

Did God allow the purity of His word to be destroyed with the original writings of Moses, David, Paul, etc.? Did He only leave man defective texts and "reliable

translations" that are not perfect or inerrant? Does a person have to be a Greek and Hebrew scholar before he can have the very words God wants him to have? These and other questions we will try to answer in the following so the Bible believer can give a good answer (1 Pet. 3:15) to those who attack his precious Bible(*KJV*), and also so someone who may be confused about the different translations can see reasons why he should believe the *Authorized King James Version of 1611* is the Bible God wants him to have, use, and most of all, *believe*.

The Basis Of This Book

The foundation of all true Christian doctrine must be the scriptures alone, so our contention that the *Authorized Version* is inerrant must be based upon precepts and principles found in them to be valid. These precepts and principles, we maintain, are easily discovered by anyone who humbly reads the Bible and believes what it says. The ONLY "textbook" the reader needs to determine if the arguments we present in the following chapters are both biblical and reasonable is the Bible itself. It should be his ultimate authority. The reader could study extra-biblical material such as manuscript evidence and become fully acquainted with the different families of Greek manuscripts and their histories, but this is not necessary to know the truth. The scriptures themselves, AS WE HAVE THEM (*KJV*), claim to be the truth (John 17:17), and all a person has to do to see if they are is OPEN THEM AND TRY THEM OUT (John 7:17)!

The study of manuscripts, however, (not of the Bible itself) is the primary occupation of many scholars. Some of them spend their entire adult life analyzing old parchments and teaching Greek (and/or Hebrew) grammar, yet they still do not have a perfect Bible. Their extensive education and great knowledge of Greek texts has not given them an infallible Bible in ANY language. Therefore, a believer should not be intimidated by the high-sounding talk of some of them who say the *King James Version* is plagued with errors. As stated before, when forced they will admit their final authority on the subject no longer exists and is not available for inspection. Thus, the reader should realize that such critical statements are only opinion no matter how "scholarly" the person may seem. Furthermore, about the only thing many of these Bible correctors have in common is their contempt for the *King James Version* as the standard English Bible—God's FINAL authority in English. They may differ among themselves about what is the best Greek text for translation and on how each word should be translated, but all will agree that the Authorized Version contains many "unfortunate errors" and needs "updating." One quickly learns when reading their material that each one has his own idea of what text and translation is best; this is why the English speaking world has over *one hundred* different translations and no two read the same! With no final authority to appeal to there can be as many Bibles as there are opinions!

Again, a Christian is not required to have a knowledge of the original languages or of manuscript evidence before he can have the truth, and neither does he have to follow those who do (or think they do). God never intended for any "elite" group of Christians to have a monopoly on His word. The believer's faith is not to be in man's "ability" to find and translate the right Greek text, but in God's promise to PRESERVE His word and supply it to His children! Therefore, we are not going to bore the reader with constant appeals to ancient manuscripts which he has never heard of, nor are we going to emphasize the opinions of scholars (of whatever persuasion) on the way Greek and Hebrew words should be translated. God has warned the believer not to trust in man or make flesh his arm (Jeremiah 17:5), so in this study we are going to trust God that He has given us His word (KJV) and believe what He has revealed to us in it.

In short, this book is written with the firm belief that the *King James Version* is innocent until proven guilty. No person has yet proven one error in it, and we believe no one ever will. Edward F. Hills in his book, *Believing Bible Study*, states on page 81:

When we defend the King James Version, we do not place it on a level with other English Bible versions and then try to find out which version has the fewest mistakes. This would be to subjective. We must start out rather with the objective fact that the King James Version is preeminently the English Bible translation on which God has placed the stamp of His approval. Hence the King James Version must be regarded as correct unless it can be conclusively shown to be otherwise. Those who assail it must be required to prove their point. By demonstrating that they cannot do so we defend our historic English Bible.

Though we do not agree with everything Dr. Hills says in this excellent book, much of it we do agree with, and what he stated above expresses our position exactly. We are not much concerned about what man in general thinks of the *King James Version*, but we are very concerned about what GOD thinks of it! It has now been more than 380 years since its arrival into history in 1611, more than enough time to allow us to accurately look back and see the attitude God has had towards it since then. A very brief examination of its fruitful history should convince any unbiased person that God's attitude towards it has been very favorable. It is clearly the English Bible He has placed His stamp of approval on at the expense of all others. In the following pages we will present some of the virtues that account for its superiority.

Which Translation Should You *Trust*?

A Defense Of The Authorized King James Version Of 1611

Chapter II

by
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright © 1993, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations (except where indicated) are from the
Authorized King James Bible

Contents

CHAPTER II

THE PROMISE OF ITS PRESERVATION

[Who Is The Preserver?](#) [Is This Really The Position Of Most](#) [One Example Of Unbelief](#) [Are We Too Critical?](#) [God's Methods Of Preservation](#) [Biblical Accounts Of Preservation](#) [Verbal And Plenary Translations?](#) [Are Translations Inferior?](#)

All true Christians agree that God wrote a Bible. They believe **"holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"** (2 Peter 1:21), and that these men wrote down many of the words God moved them to speak. These words they insist are God's very own words, thus they are pure and free from error. True Christians further proclaim, "The Bible does not contain God's word, it IS God's word." With this we have no dispute. As mentioned before, however, most scholars cannot stop here.

They must make an additional statement, one that is just as true as the others, but it also contains a dangerous implication. They will place a condition on the infallibility of the scriptures by saying: "We believe that the Bible as *originally written* is the infallible word of God." Here the scholars reveal their infidelity. This conditional statement shows they are obsessed with something God abandoned nearly two thousand years ago—the original manuscripts. If God wanted to preserve the "originals" for every generation there is no doubt He could have, but He DID NOT choose to. A Bible believing Christian has the same attitude toward them as He does: the originals have served their purpose and are NO LONGER NEEDED.

It is interesting to note that these idolized original manuscripts *never were compiled to make a complete Bible*. The word "Bible" means "book" or a "collection of books," but the original autographs of the Old Testament writers were NEVER in a single volume with the autographs of the New Testament writers! That is, the "Bible" scholars and fundamentalists place so much emphasis on NEVER EXISTED at any time in any language! The autographs of Moses, David, Isaiah, etc., had vanished from the earth long before Paul, Peter, John, and the other New Testament writers sat down to write (or speak, 2 Peter 1:21). It is not only that the scholar's final authority does not exist now in one volume, it NEVER existed! According to their doctrine, there is no time or place in history where a person could have had ALL of God's pure word (the complete canon). So the "Bible" the "scholars" appeal to to change the *King James Version* is a "mythological Bible," a final authority that is nothing but *fantasy*.

Now, of course, the original manuscripts WERE scripture, but since they all dissolved into dust centuries ago what kind of Bible do we have today? Do we have the pure and inerrant words of God available to us today? This is where the fireworks start. The issue we will address in this chapter is not whether the Bible was originally "**given by inspiration**," but whether it has been preserved for all generations to have, believe, and enjoy.

Who Is The Preserver?

That God has promised to preserve His word should be obvious to the most casual reader of the Bible. He not only loved man enough to give him His word in the first place, but He also promised to keep it pure, somewhere, for every generation. Psalm 12:6-7 is very plain on this.

6 The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

7 Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Other verses to study concerning preservation are: Deuteronomy 8:3; Psalm 119:89, 144, 152, 160; Isaiah 30:8, 40:6-8, 59:21; Jeremiah 30:2; Matthew 4:4, 5:17-18, 24:35; John 10:35; 1 Peter 1:23-25; etc. These verses prove to anyone who is willing to believe them as they stand that *God has sworn to preserve His word*. The way many of our fundamentalist friends handle them, however, is with double-talk and flawed logic. These characters will quickly agree that God has preserved His word, but then turn around and maintain that it is impossible for it to be preserved without error! Their reasoning behind this is since man is fallible, errors must have been made in copying the manuscripts, thus corrupting them to some extent; how much though they cannot determine. It is amazing how they can contradict themselves in the same breath and claim to be credible. How can something be preserved and not be preserved at the same time? How can God give His pure word, promise to preserve its purity, and then preserve it and it not be pure without Him being a liar (Romans 3:4)? These so-called scholars cannot produce one Bible in any language from anywhere on earth they believe to be completely pure and inerrant. What would this say about God's integrity if it were true? Did God fail in His promise? Perish the thought! When the Psalmist said "**thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them...**" in verse 7, he is referring to the "**pure words**" in verse 6! Furthermore, these "**pure words**" are not just some of God's words, they are all "**The words of the Lord....**" If God cannot keep His word pure and free from error, what makes these people think he can keep their SOUL! Both are spoken of as preserved (1 Thessalonians 5:23).

Concerning the words being purified "**seven times**," it is interesting to observe that the *King James Version* is the seventh major English translation. The six translations before it were: *Wyclif's Bible* (1382), *Coverdale's Bible* (1535, using *Tyndale's New Testament* from 1525), *Matthew's Bible* (1537), *The Great Bible* (1539), *The Geneva Bible* (1560), and *The Bishop's Bible* (1568). Each of these Bibles was (and still is) a valuable translation, but the *King James* of 1611 is the purest—the seventh and final purification. It has completely replaced all six of its predecessors.

We have only looked at one passage on preservation and it alone has destroyed the position of the Bible correctors. The reader is encouraged to study the others so he will have even more ammunition.

Is This Really The Position Of Most Fundamentalists?

If the reader has any doubt that what we have stated above is the position of many of the leading fundamentalists, he should get some of their books and check for himself. Or better yet, write one a letter and ask him three simple questions:

1. Do you believe the *King James Version of 1611* is the pure, inerrant word of God and absolute *final* authority for believers?
2. If no, does your FINAL AUTHORITY *exist on earth today* in pure, inerrant, tangible form in any language?
3. If yes, what and where is it? And if no, *why not*?

As simple as these questions are, many of the leading "fundamentalists" in America refuse to answer them. They refuse because they cannot answer them and still appear as "defenders of the faith." The author has read the replies of some of them who responded to questions similar to these, and they dance around them without clearly answering one. All of their scholarly talk, appeals to Greek authorities and historic positions, and references to nonexistent "originals" is just a smokescreen to veil their unbelief. They simply do not believe an infallible Bible exists. Ironically, all of these questions can be answered by a Bible believer with no more than a grade school education (or even less) in one word. To the first he will answer "Yes," this also answers the others.

The refusal of these preachers to say the *King James Version* is inerrant, however, does not mean they won't use it to their advantage. Many of them USE it exclusively in public because it is the version they want to be *identified* with, yet personally they believe it contains errors and is not the best translation. This is inconsistent to say the least. Why would a preacher, who is supposed to preach the truth, preach from (and by doing so recommend) a version he believes contains errors? If he really believes the NASV (or any other version) is better than the *King James*, why doesn't he preach from it? Would it not be a more ethical practice if he did? Do not his hearers deserve the "best" Bible? Some of the more liberal preachers who have completely abandoned the *Authorized Version* for the modern versions are more ethical in this regard than the above fundamentalists. At least they use in public the version they think is best!

One Example Of Unbelief

If there is still some doubt in the reader's mind about these matters, and he wants to check for himself to see if the statements we have made concerning the critics of the *King James Version* are accurate (which he should), there are many books he can

consult. One is John R. Rice's, *Our God-breathed Book—The Bible*, published by *Sword of the Lord Publishers*. It sets forth their inconsistent position as well as any.

The complete title on the cover of this book says: *Our God-Breathed Book—The Bible. The Verbally Inspired, Eternal, Inerrant Word Of God*. In this book Mr. Rice does a very good job of documenting why a person should believe the "Bible" is God's word, and he defends it as perfect in every way. The tragedy is the Bible Mr. Rice defends so well DOES NOT EXIST! He uses over 400 pages to explain why the Bible is "*inspired*," "*eternal*"(?), "*perfect*," and "*inerrant*," and then destroys it all by saying this Bible DOESN'T EXIST. He says on page 68 and 69 concerning inspiration (emphasis mine):

Inspiration is claimed for *original autographs*, NOT for translation or copying. When we say that the Bible is inspired, we *do not refer to the translations or copies* but to the original autographs, written down under God's direction.... But WE DO NOT claim for ANY copy or ANY translation the absolute, divine PERFECTION that was in the original autographs. Inspiration refers to the original autographs.

Since the original autographs no longer exist, Mr. Rice is actually saying that all the copies and translations that do exist are NOT "*inspired*," "*perfect*," or "*inerrant*," etc. He only allows these qualities to refer to the lost originals. Statements like this are numerous in his book. On page 84 he has a section headed, "*There Are, Then, No Errors In The Original Word Of God*," and continues insisting that inerrancy CANNOT apply to copies and translations. Clearly he does not believe God has preserved His word in its purity. As destructive as Mr. Rice's views are, they are typical for the majority of America's fundamentalist preachers and "scholars." Satan has pulled many of today's best preachers into his web of unbelief.

Our intention in this book is to slander or misrepresent no one. Again, if the reader questions some of our statements concerning the typical views of many fundamentalists and others, let him find their position out for himself by asking one the three simple questions above. The answer he gets should settle the matter.

Are We Too Critical?

Some may think we are being too critical of our fundamentalist brethren since some are soul-winners and experienced preachers (as Mr. Rice). Let them remember, however, that no matter how godly, devoted, or educated a person may be, this in no way equips him to stand in judgment on the scriptures. Since God has magnified His word above *His own name* (Psalm 138:2!), no mere human should even think

about passing judgment on them or on God's ability to preserve them. The author read the works of many of these "authorities" (like Mr. Rice's book above) soon after his conversion and was persuaded by their "scholarship" that the *King James Version* contained many errors and was not the best Bible (or even the second best) to use for "serious study." He swallowed their "only the original manuscripts are inspired" mentality and abandoned the Authorized Version as his final authority. They took his one infallible Bible away and put several conflicting "reliable translations" in its place! And since the translations they recommended contradicted each other in many places, this left him in a void WITHOUT a written final authority. It was nearly three years later before God could convince him of the fallacy of this position.

This does not mean that a believer should not follow what is scriptural in the lives of these men (soul-winning, prayer, etc.), but only that he should not be gullible enough to follow them when they correct the Bible. Follow them where they follow Christ (1 Corinthians 11:1), and where they do not follow Christ (and His word), ABANDON THEM! A TRUE Bible scholar is one who uses his knowledge and education to DEFEND the Bible. Many who claim scholarship, however, use their education as a basis to QUESTION it. Unfortunately, in this age of apostasy, there are more of the latter than the former.

Furthermore, the reader should not think the author does not believe the "fundamentals of the faith" just because of the way he speaks of "fundamentalists." He not only believes all the fundamentals, *he also believes the book they came out of (KJV)! A true Bible Believer believes the entire Bible (KJV), not just some truths extracted from it.*

Can God Use "Sinners" To Preserve His Word?

When one considers the above reason the scholars give for manuscript copies not being preserved without flaw their situation becomes even more ludicrous. They will admit the original human writers were "sinners" and that God used them to produce an infallible text, but they will not allow other sinners to be used in preserving that text. If God can use a sinner to write His pure word, *why can't He use one to preserve it?* Also, what possible reason could He have for giving His word by inspiration and having it written down and then allowing it to be hopelessly corrupted? When the scholars are confronted with questions like this they will usually produce some Greek

texts that were miss-copied by someone centuries ago and say, "We have proof that manuscripts have been corrupted." This, however, does not prove that ALL the manuscripts have been. And if one believes God meant what He said, he knows that some have not been. God did not have to guarantee that all the manuscripts had to be perfect anyway, only that His word would be preserved in some manner in pure form. The reader will find as we go along that it is much easier, safer, and more logical to take God at His word than follow the reasoning of the "doctors."

God's Methods Of Preservation

Romans 3:2 says concerning the Jews that **"unto them were committed the oracles of God."** That is, instead of speaking or revealing Himself to mankind as a whole, God spoke (with very few exceptions) only to the nation of Israel (Acts 7:38). Consequently, Israel had a monopoly on God and His words, and this was according to God's good pleasure (Deuteronomy 4:7). However, with the great honor of having the God of Heaven dwelling in their midst and the added blessing of hearing His words, came responsibility. God wanted the Jews to be a *light* unto the Gentiles and also to KEEP His words, PRESERVING them for themselves and future generations.

The group of Jews that was responsible for keeping and preserving His words were the *Levitical priests*. They were to keep the Law safe by putting it beside the Ark of the Covenant in the tabernacle (Deuteronomy 31:24-26). Since the priests were the only group of Jews that had access to the Ark and the Holy Place in the tabernacle, they were responsible for making the Law known unto the people (Deuteronomy 31:12). And when copies of it were required, they had the duty of making these also (Deuteronomy 17:18).

Later in Israel's history there were times when the priests neglected their duties, and during these dark periods God's word became unavailable for a time (2 Chronicles 15:3). God, in His providence, however, protected His word in spite of their failures (examples shortly). Even during the Babylonian captivity (which was caused in part by the priests failure to teach the people, (Micah 3:11-12), His word was available to those who wanted it (Daniel 9:2).

When the Jews returned from their captivity to rebuild Jerusalem, the scriptures were still pure and intact. Ezra, the scribe (Ezra 7:10-11), spent nearly *six hours* one day reading them to the people, and the Levites caused them to understand what he read (Nehemiah 8:1-8). During the 400 years from Ezra to the time of Christ the last books

of the Old Testament were added to the canon, and copies of it were made so meticulously and carefully that when the Lord came He made NO DISTINCTION between them and the originals! God had faithfully preserved His word, parts of it for nearly 1500 years!

After apostolic times, the Jews continued to keep the Old Testament pure. A group of them known as the *Masoretes* is credited for keeping it pure until the invention of the printing press. The first complete Hebrew text was printed in 1488. This text is called the *Masoretic* Text in memory of the Jews who so faithfully (though in blindness) preserved it through the centuries. This is the Old Testament text that was used by the King James translators.

Here, you may ask, "I understand how the Jews were responsible for preserving the Old Testament, but what about the New Testament? The Jews do not believe the New Testament to be scripture, so how was it preserved?" In much the same way as the Old Testament, only through Bible believing Christians instead of Jews.

The Lord said in Matthew 24:35, "**Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,**" indicating that His words would be preserved through eternity. Furthermore, all the Old Testament passages which refer to preservation refer to His words too because He is the same "**LORD**" speaking (Psalm 12:6). Christ also said that after He ascended back to His Father, the Holy Spirit would guide the disciples in all truth and speak to them of Christ and of things to come (John 14:25-26; 16:12-14). Many of these words were written down (or dictated) by the apostles as epistles or other letters, thus completing the New Testament canon.

At this point another question arises: Since Christ's death on the cross destroyed the Levitical priesthood, and He did not establish a special priest hood of Christians to take its place, how did early Christians determine the New Testament canon and how did they preserve it after they found it? The answer to this is found in 2 Peter 2:9 and Revelation 1:5-6. EVERY CHRISTIAN IS A PRIEST; a member of the "**royal priesthood.**" No believer has to go through any other priest to get to his "**High Priest:**" the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, the Christians of the late first century, including the apostle John, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, determined the true New Testament canon and separated it from all the phony "epistles" which were numerous at the time. This may be one reason why God allowed John to outlive the other apostles, so he could sort the true books from the false and finish the canon with *Revelation*.

The contention of the Catholics and many Protestant Denominations that the New Testament canon was not officially established until the council of Carthage in 397 A.D. is silly. Did the *first, second, third, and fourth* century Christians not know

which books were scripture until a Catholic council determined it for them? Nonsense. After John penned Revelation the matter was settled for Bible believers. The Bible was complete—66 books, each witnessed by the Holy Spirit.

Concerning the New Testament's preservation, it is only reasonable to conclude that God used the same group of people to preserve His word as He used to form the canon: *the universal priesthood of believers*. After the New Testament was completed (and even before), true believers were at work faithfully making copies for their own use and for the use of local churches. As the copies they used wore out they would make even more copies to replace them. In this manner the New Testament became widespread and its copies numerous. Needless to say, however, Satan was active in trying to stop this flood of Bibles, and he retaliated by "inspiring" counterfeit gospels and phony epistles. But the Bible believers were not fooled, they steadfastly kept God's word pure.

During this period (100 AD to 500 AD) Satan devised another devious tactic to try and stop the spread of Christianity; he raised up "scholars" to rationalize, criticize, and "revise" the scriptures. One of them, a man named *Origen*, is probably more responsible for the mass of translations we have today than anyone else in history. When he read the New Testament, the passages he couldn't understand he freely "revised," claiming the original had been miscopied. He was his OWN final authority, just like his counterparts today. Origen's humanistic attitude toward the scriptures was popular to the educated people of his day, and many so called "church fathers" became engaged in "correcting" the Bible also. Some of these "revisions" still exist today and are called "the oldest and best texts" by modern translators. It is true they are older than the majority of manuscripts, but the main reason they still exist is because Christians down through history knew they were corrupt and never used them. The "scholars" today who accept them are much more gullible than the average Christian of the fifth century. The "*Textus Receptus*" copies of the New Testament we have today are newer only because the believers were *constantly handling and reading their parent copies*, they simply WORE THEM OUT!

Near the beginning of the "*dark ages*" (now called the "*middle ages*" by those who ignore the millennium of Catholic inquisition) Satan made one of his most ingenious and diabolical moves. He "Christianized" the pagan religion of Rome and formed what is now known as the *Roman Catholic Church*. He led the Roman emperor Constantine to prepare the way for his brand of Christianity to become the state religion, making it illegal for Christians to "worship" except through the church at Rome. Though many believers were deceived and joined with the "**MOTHER OF HARLOTS**" (Revelation 17:5), many others refused and were sorely persecuted (see *Foxe's Book Of Martyrs*). This persecution continued for centuries, but small remnants of believers, scattered throughout Europe and western Asia, remained true to

God and continued to preserve His word in various languages. These believers were known by many different names (*Waldensians, Albigensians, Lollards*, and others), but they all believed they had God's word and were not about to let the pope take it from them. Many of them died horrible deaths at the hands of the Catholics because of their steadfast refusal to conform to Rome's doctrines or give up their beloved Bible. There were times when the Romanists would find some of their Bible texts and burn them in great piles with much ceremony, but there were always some copies that escaped detection. During this millennium of darkness untold gallons of blood was shed to preserve the purity of the scriptures. Does your Bible mean that much to you?

As with the Old Testament, the invention of the printing press changed things, and in 1516 some New Testament manuscripts were compiled together to make a complete text and was printed. The press made the Bible much more available to the public and thus harder to destroy. This directly led to the Protestant Reformation. This text, after some revision, became known as the *Traditional Text* or the *Received Text* (*Textus Receptus*). The corrupt text that came from Origen is called the *Alexandrian Text*. It was named this because it originated in Alexandria *Egypt* (a type of the world). The *Textus Receptus* originated in AntiochSyria; the place where the disciples were first called "**Christians**" (Acts 11:26), and the center of operations for Paul's missionary journeys (Acts 13:1-3).

For an enlightening study, the reader is encouraged to check all the verses in the Bible which mention "**Alexandria**" or "**Antioch.**" "**Alexandria**" is usually mentioned in a negative light (Acts 6:9) and "Antioch" in a positive (Acts 11:26). Is the Holy Spirit trying to tell us something? Undoubtedly so.

The two most "universally esteemed" representatives of the *Alexandrian Text* are the vile *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* manuscripts. These two corruptions are considered "the oldest and best texts" by most scholars, yet they have *hundreds* of contradictory readings between them and THOUSANDS compared with the *Textus Receptus*. Furthermore, these two manuscripts were LOST to humanity for nearly *one thousand years!* *Vaticanus* "turned up" in the Vatican in 1481; *Sinaiticus* was discovered in a Catholic monastery in the mid nineteenth century. Did God lose His "best" manuscripts until then? Did the Christians before this time not have access to the "most reliable and accurate texts?" Nonsense. The Bible believers of the past knew these manuscripts were corrupt because they didn't agree with their pure Bibles and because their sworn enemy the Catholics had them. "**By their fruits ye shall know them**"

In short, the *Authorized Version* was translated from the God honored *Received Text* which is covered with the blood of countless martyrs; nearly all the "new" translations came (at least partially) from the corrupt *Alexandrian Text* which no one

shed a drop of blood to protect. This alone should make any Christian think twice before he abandons the *King James Version* for a modern translation.

Biblical Accounts Of Preservation

"Now," you may ask, "your brief appeal to church history was interesting, but are there any examples in the *Bible* of God preserving His Word?" I am glad you asked, of course there are. To list just a few, check where the high priest during Josiah's reign found the **"book of the law"** hidden in the **"house of the Lord"** (2 Kings chapter 22). God kept a pure copy hidden during the years of rebellion and idolatry so the good king Josiah could find it and bring about reforms in the land.

For another example check in Jeremiah chapter 36, where Jeremiah had **"all the words of the Lord"** written upon a roll (vs. 4). Then see how after the roll was cut up and burned (by a Bible revisor), God commanded him to write **"all the former words"** (vs. 28) upon another roll, plus, some NEW WORDS (vs. 32)! This is very significant. The ORIGINAL is destroyed and Jeremiah makes a COPY of all the original words and then adds MORE. The copy is NOT identical to the original yet *BOTH are scripture!* They do not contradict but complement each other, similar to how each of the four Gospels complements the others without contradiction. The lesson here is: *a copy does not have to be verbally and plenarily identical to the original to be scripture* (more on this later).

For a New Testament account showing preservation, look in Luke chapter 4 where the Lord goes into the synagogue to read **"the book of the prophet Esaias..."** remembering that He read from a COPY of Isaiah and NOT the original. He did not once correct any "errors that crept into the text" or omit any words which were "added" by scribes. *The copy He read from was just as pure as the original.* If it wasn't He would have said so (Matthew 4:4)!

The above reference leads us to consider the critic's argument that copies cannot be as pure as the original. The *King James Version* completely decimates the logic of those who hold this view. To quickly settle this "problem," one needs only to believe two verses: 2 Timothy 3:15-16. This is the classic passage on the inspiration of the scriptures. Most Christians are familiar with verse 16, but let's look at verse 15 with it. Paul says in verse 15 that Timothy had known the **"holy scriptures"** since he was a child, and in verse 16 he says **"all scripture is given by inspiration of God..."** It is clear Paul considered the **"scriptures"** (copies) Timothy had to be **"given by inspiration,"** since he says in the next verse that **"all scripture"** is. These two verses alone prove that COPIES can be **"given by inspiration."** What a terrible passage to

face if one has "originalitis"! These verses are so plain in declaring that copies can be scripture that some of the new "Bibles" change them so their scholars can "save face." The reader should carefully note that verse 16 does not say the original writings WERE given by inspiration, but that *all scripture IS*(present tense).

Scholars use this passage to teach that only the "originals" were inspired, but it says no such thing! Not one time in the Bible is the word "**scripture(s)**" a reference to an original autograph. It ALWAYS refers to a *copy*! The originals were "**given by inspiration**" not because they were original manuscripts, but because they were SCRIPTURE. The key word is SCRIPTURE. Do not make the mistake of forcing the Bible to teach something it does not say, but remember, for a text to be scripture it does NOT have to be the original. God makes no distinction between the purity of an original and of an accurate copy made of it, *even a copy made from another copy hundreds of years after the original!*

Since "**all scripture is given by inspiration of God,**" the "**scripture**" Christ quoted in Luke 4 was pure, as were the "**scriptures**" He commanded the Jews to search in John 5. Likewise, the "**scripture**" the Ethiopian eunuch had in Acts 8 was pure; the "**scriptures**" the Bereans had in Acts 17 were pure; the "**scripture**" Paul had in Romans 4 was pure; and also, according to Peter, all the epistles of Paul are scripture and thus pure (2 Peter 3:16). Every reference to scripture in the Bible is a reference to God's infallible, inerrant word. Whether the scripture is an original autograph or a copy is immaterial. God does not esteem the former above the latter in any way and neither should we.

Now that we have shown that God's word must exist somewhere on earth in pure form you may ask: "How does one determine where God's word is or which Bible it is"? Or, "How can one know the *King James Version* is pure and free from error"? In the following chapters we will address these questions, but there is something else we must look into first.

"Verbal" And "Plenary" Translations?

Fundamentalists often say they believe in the "verbal (word for word) and plenary (complete and total) inspiration of the scriptures." One could say this about the originals, but they purposely say "*scripture,*" leading Christians to think only the originals are scripture. According to the way most scholars use these two terms, before any text can truly be scripture, it has to be *identical* (word for word) with the original. This is the principal reason they insist only the originals can be inspired. They maintain no one can know for certain if he has a pure Bible because he cannot

prove that the text he has is an exact duplicate of the autograph (exact as far as the words are concerned). The folly in this is assuming that all scripture must be verbally and plenary identical to the original.

The Holy Spirit does not use the terms "verbal" and "plenary" to describe scripture. He simply says it is "**given by inspiration**" (God-breathed). Verbal and plenary are terms theologians use to define *their idea* of inspiration. Evidently, the Holy Spirit's choice of words is not enough for them. At this point you may be thinking: "Do you mean to tell me that the Bible is not inspired word for word and completely and totally? I have believed this all my life and...." Well, "hold your horses" and don't jump to conclusions. We just mentioned how we believe "**the words of the Lord are pure words,**" how we believe all scripture is infallible, inerrant, "God-breathed," and how we believe we have a copy. What we are referring to here is terminology. How words and terms are used and the implications that result from their use.

If *verbal* and *plenary* are used the way most scholars use them, no one could know he had a perfect Bible or not because the standard or authority to appeal to no longer exists. However, if we use Bible terminology, i.e. "**given by inspiration,**" and do not force the scriptures to say something they do not, a person can know he has the words God wants him to have. This is really the heart of the Bible controversy: can a person KNOW he has a copy of the Scriptures—the pure words of the living God? We contend that he can; not because of man's ability, but because of God's promise of preservation.

Concerning translations, the Bible critic's mentality compels him to dogmatically proclaim that NO translation can be inspired because it is impossible for it to be *verbally* and *plenary* identical to the original. In their way of thinking, it could be possible for a Greek text to be identical with the "original Greek," but never a translation. They insist translated words cannot have precisely the same meaning as the words in the original language. Granted they can't, *but who says they have to?* The Bible doesn't. This argument is based on the assumption that only the original language can convey the exact words God wants man to have, but *the Bible makes no such requirement*. In fact, it allows for the alternative.

There are several places in the scriptures where a translation is "**given by inspiration.**" Joseph, when he was a ruler in Egypt, spoke to his brethren in *Egyptian* (Genesis 42:23). There is no record of anything he said to them being written down in Egyptian. Moses later made an account in *Hebrew*, and this Hebrew text is the text given by inspiration. To say that a translation cannot be "word-perfect" is to invent a problem where no problem exists. It does not bother God that languages are dissimilar, He can give man the words He wants him to have without worrying about being "word-perfect." Likewise, when Moses and Pharaoh talked to each other

concerning the release of the Israelites they also conversed in Egyptian (Exodus chapters 4-14). Moses, again, recorded all the words in Hebrew.

Suppose Pharaoh's court recorder recorded all the words spoken between Moses and Pharaoh in Egyptian. Would it not be the original and Moses' account a mere translation? Would not this "original Egyptian" text be the "verbal and plenary" account of what was said? Yet which one is given by inspiration? See the problems scholars make for themselves? If one follows their reasoning, the account of Moses we have today has two strikes against it: it is a COPY AND A TRANSLATION! Does this mean anything regarding it being scripture? Of course not! Suppose we had the Egyptian original before us today, would it be better than the *copies* we have of Moses' *translation*? Not at all. The writings of Moses are scripture (2 Timothy 3:16); the first-hand account of a recorder is not, *even if it is the "original"*!

For another example, look in Acts 22, where Paul speaks to the Jews in Hebrew and Luke records it in Greek! There is no Hebrew manuscript of Paul's words in existence. Does this affect their purity? You should know the answer. Each one of these three translations (and there are over *thirty* more) God has honored and "**given by inspiration.**" They all are scripture, yet God did not see fit to record them in the Bible in their original language. Some people behave like they have forgotten that God knows all languages. He knows German as well as Hebrew and English as well as Greek. Of course, every believer will agree with this, but many act like they do not. What God sees as no problem (having an translation "given by inspiration"), Bible scholars and translators see as a great problem. God can give His words to *anyone in any language* EXACTLY the way He wants them to have them, without the words being "verbally" and "plenarily" identical to the original language. Many Christians, from listening to the "scholars" humanistic rhetoric to long, have been brainwashed and cannot understand this, but it is no problem for a Bible reading Bible believer.

Are Translations Inferior?

Another fact concerning translations is that in the three verses the word "translate" (or forms of it) is found in the Bible, the object translated is BETTER than it was to start with! I know this is heresy to the "scholars", but look at the passages yourself. The first verse is 2 Samuel 3:10. There, the kingdom is to be "translated" from the house of Saul to David. When one reads the context of this passage, and of the reign of David after, he finds the kingdom becomes *better* than it was in its original state! It is unified under one king, and he is the best king they will ever have until Christ returns! The second translation is found in Colossians 1:13. The translation here is the conversion of a lost sinner to the kingdom of Jesus Christ. No Christian can say

this is not a translation for the better! The last mention is in Hebrews 11:5 where Enoch is spoken of as being "**translated.**" Again, no believer in his right mind can say a person would not be better off to bypass death and go directly to Heaven. Enoch's translation is a *vast improvement* over his original condition.

As mentioned before, we agree that no translation can be "word-perfect" with the original, but this in no way means, as scholars assume, that a translation is of a lesser quality. *It could just as easily be (as we have just seen) BETTER in quality than the original!* The word of God does NOT lose its purity and authority by being translated. God can easily direct or influence translators to choose words that say what He wants said in any language. The words chosen may have a slightly different meaning than the original word, or they may not convey all of its "idioms" and "inflections" and the like, but so what? Many English words also have a uniqueness about them and can convey thoughts that no single Greek or Hebrew word can. It works both ways. God knew this, and He directed the *Authorized Version* translators accordingly. This is not to say that the translators themselves were inspired, but only that God used them to preserve His word in its purity in the English language.

Now that we have seen how God has promised to preserve His word, how He did preserve it, and how copies and translations can be scripture, we will begin to look at the *King James Version* in particular and see why it is to be preferred above all others.

Which Translation Should You *Trust*?

A Defense Of The Authorized King James Version Of 1611

Chapter III

by
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright © 1993, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations (except where indicated) are from the
Authorized King James Bible

Contents

CHAPTER III

WHAT'S SO SPECIAL ABOUT THE KING JAMES VERSION?

[The Time Of Its Publication](#) [Must Every Language Have A Perfect Bible?](#) [The Ability And Character Of Its Translators](#)

[The Qualification Of Suffering](#) [Their Attitude Toward The Scriptures](#) [Were The Translators Inspired?](#)

That the *King James Version* is still being published 380 years after it first arrived in history is amazing. Since its introduction, there have been dozens of new "Bibles" put on the market to replace it, but none have succeeded. This alone is strong evidence that it is the version God has placed His stamp of approval on. One time a person of prominence asked a Christian for one reason why he should believe the Bible is the word of God. The believer responded with two words: "The Jew." His reasoning was since the Jewish people have been severely persecuted for most of their history, and many other nations have targeted them for complete annihilation, the fact they still exist with the same religion, culture, and language they began with *proves* the Bible to be true. This can be said of no other ancient nation. The Bible predicted in several places that the Jews would never be completely wiped from the face of the earth, and it also predicted their return to their land (Jeremiah 30:11, Ezekiel 34:13, 36:24, etc). Unlike the *Philistines*, *Moabites*, *Amorites*, and many other cultures which were once neighbors with Israel, the Jew remains unto this day.

The same can be said about the *King James Version*. Much like the Jew it has undergone *persecution, slander, attempted corruption and annihilation, constant criticism*, and the like since the day it was first proposed. That it has endured through the centuries unscathed has much to say about the authority behind it. *The Revised Version*, which came out in 1885, was published primarily to replace it as the English Bible. To my knowledge, no publisher prints it today! *The American Standard Version* (1901) is an "Americanized" version of the RV, and it has nearly passed into obscurity also. Why has the *King James Version* endured while others published to replace it fall by the wayside? What is so special about it? In this chapter we will examine some reasons why we consider it the "King" of Bibles.

The Time Of Its Publication

When the *King James Version* was translated the English language was at its peak. By the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries English had already passed through its formative years and had become one of the richest and most expressive languages the world has ever known. The book, *The Story Of English*, written by Robert McCrum, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil says on page 91 concerning this period:

Elizabeth I came to the throne in 1558 at the age of twenty-five. William Shakespeare, her most famous subject, was born in 1564. Her successor, James I, who gave his name to another English masterpiece, the Authorized Version of the Bible, died in 1625. During their reigns, about seventy years, the English language achieved a richness and vitality of expression that even contemporaries marveled at.

The authors go on to say on page 109 that the *King James Version of 1611* is "probably the single most influential book ever published in the English language." Not the *RV*, *ASV*, *NIV*, etc., but the *King James Version*. Does this statement in itself not make it worthy of very careful consideration? Ever wonder WHO is responsible for it being so influential?

It is fascinating that English language experts, who make no claim to Christianity, have in some respects a higher regard for the *King James Version* than many saved Bible scholars! Though these men may not consider the *Authorized Version* the pure word of God (they may not believe God's word ever existed), they do consider it a "masterpiece" of supreme influence. And who in his right mind would attempt to correct, revise, or in any way tamper with such a masterpiece? One that millions past and present believe to be the very word of God? No one but a *professional Bible corrector* (Genesis 3). In universities, seminaries, and Bible colleges all over the world there are "scholars" and teachers who systematically tear apart the *King James Version* and revise it (many of the new versions claim to be a revision of it), claiming to be correcting its (supposed) errors. They would never think of changing or revising the masterpieces of *Shakespeare*, *Bacon*, *Jonson*, or other masters of literature of the period, but they butcher the *King James Version* under the guise that it does not accurately translate the "original Greek," or that it is based on corrupt manuscripts. As we have pointed out before, there is no "original Greek" in existence, and the manuscripts they charge as "corrupt" represent the majority and are covered with the blood of countless believers. Clearly the Bible corrector's excuses for "improving the *King James Version*" are nothing but more opinionated HOT AIR!

At this point you may be thinking: "Am I to believe the *King James Version* is the pure, preserved word of God just because of its richness, vitality, and literary excellence?" No, not entirely, but the fact it was translated when the English language was at its climax is a *very strong indication* that God was behind it. Who knew that in the early seventeenth century the English language would peak? Who knew that after this period it would become weaker and less able to convey the meaning of Greek and Hebrew words? Why no one but God! Let's take this a step farther. Who knew in 1611 that English would later become the predominate language of the world when in that year less than TWO PERCENT of the world's population spoke it? Again, no one but God (Acts 15:18). The translators themselves did not realize that God was using them to prepare a standard Bible in the "universal language" of the future. Now, English is spoken by one-fifth of the earth's population—over one *BILLION* people!

In fact, English is not only the standard for *absolute truth* (*KJV*), but also the standard for *absolute time* (Greenwich, England; the prime meridian), *absolute location* (longitude and latitude), and *absolute temperature* (Kelvin system). So the final authority for *time, temperature, location, and TRUTH is ENGLISH!* The little island country of England has, by God's favor and grace, supplied man with standards to show him his standing in relation to other people, to the world, and most importantly, with God.

Must Every Language Have A Perfect Bible?

Frequently, when Bible believers say the *King James Version* is the pure, inerrant word of God, someone will object and say: "If God gives the English speaking people a perfect Bible as you claim, is He not obligated to give one in every other language?" The answer is a resounding NO! Bible correctors and ignorant Christians often use this type of "logic" to try and intimidate the believer into thinking it is impossible for the *Authorized Version* to be pure and inerrant. Actually, they are saying either the *King James Version* has errors in it or God is unjust in not giving all other nations a perfect Bible in their own language. With this kind of either/or reasoning, they try to force the Bible believer to concede that the *Authorized Version* has errors in it by insisting that if it does not, God's integrity is in question. What a devious tactic: trying to pit the believer's love and respect for God against God's word and promises. These people did not learn this type of reasoning by studying the Bible; it is purely human, if not Satanic.

Nowhere in the scriptures does God make any statement or implication that there must be a perfect Bible in every language. He has promised to preserve His word for *every*

generation as we have seen, but He has not promised to preserve it in every existing language. Let's look at the language of the original autographs for a moment. Nearly all of the Old Testament was written in *Hebrew*, however, no nation spoke Hebrew except the Israelites. God was not obligated to give His word in Egyptian, Syrian, Chaldian, or any other language. His word was available to the people in these nations also, but they had to go to the Jews to get it. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God (see chapter 2), and there were provisions in the law to allow strangers (foreigners) to convert to Judaism. Look at Ruth the Moabite for example. She was David's great-grandmother, an ancestor of Jesus Christ.

The same can be said about the New Testament language, *Greek*. Though it was a more widespread language than Hebrew, there were still millions of people who could not understand it when the New Testament was written. Again, God was not then, or now, obligated to give His word in every existing language, and those who argue He must be ignorant of history and of the scriptures.

God, who will not be intimidated by modern "scholarship," decided to combine His word into one *universal* language to make it more accessible to all men. He knew how English would circle the globe under the British empire and American influence. He knew how in the twentieth century English would be the second language for millions. He knew how it would become the world language of *diplomacy*, *finance*, and *airlines*, as well as of *absolute time*, *temperature*, and *position*. By his grace, God has made His word more available, readable and understandable by putting it in English; much more than it ever was in the "original languages."

Another thing we should note here is the *King James Version* was translated before the great movements of unbelief swept the world. *German rationalism*, *French skepticism*, and *English deism* were not yet in force to affect the mentality of the translators. These philosophies have since then done more harm to the cause of Christ than will be known this side of Heaven. They have turned the majority of educated people into practical atheists. That nearly all the Bible translators since 1611 have been infected by these viruses can be seen by the doubt ("Yea hath God said") they spread by saying there is no infallible Bible on earth. This is one reason why God had His word put in the future universal language in 1611. The *King James Version* translators had a much more Biblical outlook on God and His word than the translators of today, and this will become apparent in the next section.

Before we move on, let's look at something Dr. William Lyon Phelps, Professor of English Literature in Yale University said as found in the book, *Which Bible*, edited by David Otis Fuller:

Now as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorized Version; all others are inferior.

The Ability And Character Of Its Translators

The men King James picked (Ecclesiastes 8:4) to translate the Bible we now know as the **King James Version** were some of the most learned and gifted men in the world. There were fifty-four men chosen for this task, but a few either died or dropped out, and forty-seven were left to see it to completion. There are several profitable books the reader can consult (we will list some in the bibliography) that give many details of the scholarship, ability, humility, and overall character of these men, but in this brief section we can only mention a few of their most notable virtues.

Many Christians today are lead to believe that the scholarship behind the new translations is superior to that of the *King James Version*. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The *Authorized Version* translators were of *unparalleled ability*, and one would be hard pressed to find a group of translators today of any size who could even equal the ability of FIVE of the men King James selected. It is said of one of them: "his memory and reading were near to a miracle" (John Reynolds). Another was called "mighty in the scriptures" as Apollos was (Thomas Holland). Another was disinherited by his father for leaving the Roman Catholic Church and becoming a Protestant (Laurence Chaderton). One began to read Hebrew at the age of five and attended college at fourteen (John Boys). He sometimes studied in the library from 4 a.m. until 8 p.m. Even while suffering from smallpox he would not neglect his studies. Another (Lancelot Andrewes) had advanced knowledge of *Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, plus fifteen modern languages*. He accomplished all of this while "a great part of five hours every day he spent in prayer." This only begins to mention the great ability, accomplishments, and devotion of these men.

Great ability and education can be a curse, however, without meekness and humility, and the translators had these virtues also. They were not men who were "puffed up" and who flaunted their education, but men who were governed by a pious and humble spirit. This can readily be seen in the dedicatory of the *Authorized Version* written by Miles Smith:

So that, if on the one side we shall be traduced by Popish persons at home or abroad, who

therefore will maligne us, because we are poor Instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness: or if on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil: we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocence of a good conscience, having walked the way of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord....

He also says in the translators to the reader (preface):

To that purpose there were many chosen, that were greater in other men's eyes then in their own, and sought the truth rather than their own praise.

The Qualification Of Suffering

Not only were the translators of great ability and character, but many of them knew what it meant to suffer for Christ. They endured persecution, hardships, and mistreatment by the hands of the enemies of the gospel. This, however, only refined them, making them more like their Saviour. They not only BELIEVED the words of comfort in the scriptures, they KNEW they were true. As the biographer of William Tyndale (a man of like character who translated an earlier English Version) said as found in, *Which Bible*, page 259:

So Tyndale thought; but God had ordained that not in the learned leisure of a palace, but amid the dangers and privations of exile should the English Bible be produced. Other qualifications were necessary to make him a worthy translator of Holy Scripture than mere grammatical scholarship... At the time he bitterly felt what seemed to be the total disappointment of all his hopes; but he afterwards learned to trace in what appeared a misfortune the fatherly guidance of God; and this very disappointment, which compelled him to seek his whole comfort in the Word of God, tended to qualify him for the worthy performance of his great work.

One qualification that modern day translators cannot meet is this qualification of suffering. Compared to Tyndale and the *Authorized Version* translators, they DO assemble in the "learned leisure of a palace" with no threat of persecution to "qualify" them.

Furthermore, in 1611 there were none of the "modern conveniences" such as radio, television, and telephones, to steal the translators time (not to mention corrupt their minds). They were able to meditate and study upon the word without many of the distractions believers endure today. They used their time to carefully examine every variation between the Greek texts and to consider every possible translation for each word. All is clear, God knew what He was doing when He chose the time for His word to be perfected in English and the men to do it.

Their Attitude Toward The Scriptures

Another significant and essential quality of the King James translators was that they ALL believed the Bible to be the word of God and without error. Though they were from varied backgrounds and differed on church order and administration and some other matters, each one had the highest regard for the scriptures and believed them to be the very words of the living God. Again, Miles Smith states in the preface (emphasis mine):

But now what piety without truth? What truth (what saving truth) without the word of God? What word of God (whereof we may be sure) without the Scripture? *The Scriptures we are commanded to search....*

Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, *one principle good one*, not justly excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark.

Mr. Smith says above the scriptures ARE the word of God. And since he was one of the translators, he knew the scriptures could not be the lost original manuscripts (2 Timothy 3:16) because we ARE (present tense!) commanded to search them! (This cannot be said about many of the translators of the new versions. *Westcott and Hort*, the two main figures behind the *Revised Version* of 1885, never stated they believed the Bible to be given by inspiration of God. Not even the famed original manuscripts! Another on the committee openly denied the deity of Jesus Christ! Would God use lost people to preserve His word?)

Furthermore, Dr. Smith states that the intention of the translators was to make a good translation better so the English-speaking people could have "one principle" copy of the scriptures. Also, in a previous quotation from the preface we saw that they wanted to help the common man out of "ignorance and darkness" by making the Bible more accessible and understandable. The aforementioned book, *The Story Of English*, also

mentions this on page 113 from a secular viewpoint:

The King James Bible was published the year Shakespeare began work on his play, *The Tempest*. Both the play and the Bible are masterpieces of English, but there is one crucial difference between them. Whereas Shakespeare ransacked the lexicon, the King James Bible employs a bare 8000 words—God's teaching in homely English for everyman.

In this the humility and integrity of the translators is seen. Their goal was not to impress people with their vast learning, or "brow-beat" the less fortunate with their superior intellect, they only wanted to produce a version of the Bible that was as accurate, readable, and simple as possible. How God has blessed their labors. (The translators of the "new Bibles" try to use this same reasoning to justify their "perversions," but later we will see this is not their primary motive at all).

Were The Translators "Inspired"?

At this point some may take issue and say: "No where do any of the King James translators, in the preface or in other writings, claim to be inspired or claim perfection for their translation." This is true, but biblically it has nothing to do with the issue. First of all, they did not have to be "inspired" to be used to preserve the already "God-breathed" word. Bible believers do not claim inspiration for the translators; only the WORDS (scripture) are "given by inspiration." Also, that they did not claim perfection for their translation does not mean that it cannot be so. God does not have to reveal to people what He is doing through them (1 Peter 1:10). For example, does Matthew say anywhere in his gospel that everything he is writing is scripture? How about Mark in his gospel? Does Paul say in Romans (and many of his other epistles) that he is penning (or speaking) only the very words of God? No they do not. God was using human writers to pen His words, *but they did not always know (if many knew at all) He was doing it!* Likewise, God could use the *King James* translators to preserve and perfect His word in all its purity in English WITHOUT THEM KNOWING IT.

The Translation Undertaken

When these men began to translate in 1604 they were divided into six committees, each one working on a section of the Bible. Every member of each committee

worked individually, and after he finished with his section, he brought it to his committee for group examination. They would then all go over it together, and once they agreed on the reading, they would send it to another committee for their examination. In this manner the whole Bible was carefully gone over at least FOURTEEN times. If there was any special problem with a word or passage, they would send a letter to every learned man in England for assistance. This process took over seven years to complete. It is obvious these men were devoted to making the translation as perfect and complete as possible. In 1611, after a final examination by a small group of translators, the text was completed and sent to the printers. The rest, as they say, is history.

Which Translation Should You *Trust*?

A Defense Of The Authorized King James Version Of 1611

Chapter IV

by
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright © 1993, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations (except where indicated) are from the
Authorized King James Bible

Contents

CHAPTER IV

WHAT'S SO SPECIAL ABOUT THE KING JAMES VERSION?

cont.

[No Copyright](#) [Its Language](#) [Its Honesty Concerning The Apocrypha](#)

[The Agreement Of Its Different Editions](#) [Textus Receptus or King James?](#) [The Bible God Uses](#)

The Use Of Italics

Now that we have briefly looked at the translators and their motives, let's look at the result of their labors. One reason the *King James Version* is the most honest English Bible is because of its use of italics. When the translators had to supply a word (or words) in the *Authorized Version* to make it make sense in English, they put it in italics. That is, they were honest in showing the words they added to the text. This is something the translators of nearly all the modern versions failed to do. The *New International Version*, for one, has the translated words and the words the translators added in the same type. There is no way a reader can tell which is which. Obviously, indicating the added words is a more ethical practice, yet the *Authorized Version* translators are often criticized for doing so.

Some people ignorantly claim that all the italicized words should be removed, but this would be harmful. It would make some Bible passages unclear or difficult to understand because they would not contain complete sentences in English (Psalm 58:7-8 for example). Others insist that only *some* of the italicized words should be removed or at least changed, but which ones? Of course, only the ones THEY want removed or changed. The italicized word "**unknown**" in 1 Corinthians 14 is one that is often in debate. Some want to remove it because some others build an outrageous doctrine upon it. Many of the Charismatics teach the "**unknown tongue**" is an "angelic language" that no one on earth can understand, but it is clear from reading the entire chapter that Paul is referring to foreign languages which are unknown only to the HEARERS. This is plain without removing the italicized words. The added word does not confuse the text as some claim, it clarifies what type of tongue (language) Paul is speaking about. In the preface of the *Authorized Version* one will find the words "unknown tongue" used in the same manner—a foreign language. It's not the Bible's fault some people "**wrest the scriptures**" (2 Peter 3:16).

God has honored the *King James Version*, italics and all, for over 380 years, and it would be very presumptuous for anyone to change it in any way. Furthermore, there is evidence of God's hand concerning the italics in the English text itself. Look at Romans 10:20, where Paul quotes Isaiah 65:1. In Isaiah 65:1 the words "**them that**" are in italics; they are not in the Hebrew. However, in Romans 10:20, the words are NOT in italics because the Greek words for them are there! Paul quotes the Hebrew as if the words are there, but they are not in any Hebrew text; they are only found in the *Authorized Version text*! (Some may claim Paul is quoting a pre-Christian Greek "Septuigent," but there is no such thing.) This is not the only place where this occurs. Compare Psalm 16:8 with Acts 2:25 ("**he is**"); Psalm 94:11 with 1 Corinthians 3:20 ("**are**"); Deuteronomy 25:4 with 1 Corinthians 9:9 ("**the corn**"); and Deuteronomy 8:3 with Matthew 4:4 ("**word**"). With such evidence that God is behind the italics in **King James Version**, what kind of person would dare tamper with them?

No Copyright

Another significant advantage the *Authorized Version* has over the other versions is its lack of a commercial copyright. Check the title-page of any *King James Bible* for a copyright notice. If you find one it will be for something other than the Bible text itself, such as study notes, cross references, maps, etc. (as in the *Scofield Reference Bible*). Now check the "new Bibles," any or all of them. They all have one without exception. From this we learn a very important lesson. The words in these "Bibles" are not God's words, they are *MAN'S words*! You say, "How can you say they are man's words?" Very simple, just look up the definition of a copyright. The *Columbia Concise Encyclopedia* defines a copyright as (emphasis mine):

(The) statutory right of the CREATOR to exclusive control of an ORIGINAL literary or artistic production. The copyright holder may reproduce the work or license others to do so, and receive PAYMENTS (royalties) for each performance or copy.

Unlike the "crown copyright" that King James granted to printer Robert Barker so the *Authorized Version* could be printed, a modern copyright expresses authorship and ownership. So all the publishers of the new versions are admitting to the world that the "Bibles" they publish are not God's word, but THEIR WORD! Now, of course, they will cry foul because we say this, but the commercial copyright is still there. They often say it is only there to protect the text from being tampered with. Well, if

this is true, why does one have to ask them permission and sometimes even PAY ROYALTIES to use or quote from their translations?

According to 1 Timothy 2:9 the word of God is NOT BOUND. It is FREE for anyone to use, quote, or print without having to get permission from or pay anybody! The only Bible in English still in print that meets this requirement is the *King James Version of 1611*. God's word, like His salvation, is free, so why would anyone think one of these new copyrighted "Bibles" was His word? Remember, a copyright protects WORDS (not paper, leather, and ink), so when one buys any book other than the *Authorized Version* some of the payment is for the words themselves. Of the millions of books in the Library of Congress, only one of any significance is NOT copyrighted. Should it be any surprise whose book it is?

Its Language

The *King James Version* is often criticized because of its use of what is called "archaic language." The translators of the modern versions ride this "hobby horse" to death by using it to justify THEIR versions. With all the new "Bibles" that have appeared in the last 100 years claiming to do this, one would think the "updating" would be complete. Has English become "archaic" 100 times since 1885 when the *Revised Version* came out? According to many scholars it must have. Evidently, the RV's translators did a poor job of "modernizing" the words because dozens of newer "revised" versions have come out since then each claiming to do the same.

This, however, is just a smokescreen. The translator's primary desire is not to modernize the words, *they want to change the TEXT*. The public was told the RV was to be the *Authorized Version* updated to modern language, but that is NOT what they got. This corrupt perversion had thousands of TEXTUAL differences with the *Authorized Version*. It omitted verses, cast doubt on passages ("yea hath God said"), and weakened many fundamental doctrines. The translators, under the guise of "updating the language," produced one of the most destructive books in history. This "Bible," and the corrupt text behind it, has directly led to the publication of scores of corrupt versions which are the cause of much of the confusion and unbelief in the Christian world today.

Instead of falling for this obvious deception, let's look at some of the reasons the "archaic language" of the *Authorized Version* is SUPERIOR to the language of any modern version. The *Authorized Version's* personal pronouns ("ye," "yea," "thee," "thou," etc.) are often criticized because the words are not in common use today. Granted, they may not be common "street" terms, but they are still easily

understandable by the vast majority of people. Here, someone may say, Why doesn't someone just substitute "you" and "your" for these terms and make the Bible simpler for everybody? Well, for one very good reason. The personal pronouns of the *King James Version* are a much more direct and accurate translation of certain words than "you" and "your" are alone. Dr. Bruce Cummons explains the difference in the December 1988 issue of, *The Plains Baptist Challenger*, edited by E.L. Bynum.

In the language of the Greek New Testament and the Hebrew Old Testament there is a very distinct difference between the second person singular and the second person plural pronouns. We make no difference in modern English—both singular and plural are translated "you." However, in old English there exists a difference just as there is in Greek and Hebrew. As a result the old English from the King James Version gives a far more precise translation than would modern English.

In our King James Bible, "thee," "thou," "thy," and "thine" are always singular. "You," "ye," "and" "your" are always plural. If the second person pronoun starts with a "t" (in the English translation) then it is singular. If it starts with "y" it is plural....

It is interesting to note that, contrary to popular opinion, the word "you" is used in the King James Version of the Bible about 2000 times in fact. The "thee's" and "ye's" are used also for accuracy and directness of translation....

So the reason the *King James Version* translators used these "archaic" pronouns is not because the pronouns "you" and "your" were not available, but because of ACCURACY! Just because modern English is inferior to "old" English does not mean we must have a Bible that is also. As we mentioned before, God knew by His foreknowledge when to compile His Bible in its final form and He also knew what language to put it in. Again we quote Benjamin Wilkinson in, *Which Bible*, page 247:

Since then (1611), words have lost (their) living, pliable breath. Vast additions have been made to the English vocabulary in the last 300 years, so that several words are now necessary to convey the same meaning which formerly was conveyed by one. It will then be readily seen that while the English vocabulary has increased in quantity, nevertheless, single words have lost their many shades...and therefore less adaptable to receiving into English the thoughts of the Hebrew.... New Testament Greek, is, in this respect, like the Hebrew.

"This may be true," you say, "but there are still some words in the *Authorized Version* I don't understand." Come on now, what do you think dictionaries are for? Any time you come to a word you are in doubt of consult a dictionary. The older the better. Some words in the *Authorized Version* do have a different meaning today

than they did in the seventeenth century, but, again, it's not the Bible's fault English has degenerated. This still does not warrant a change in the *King James* text though. The most that should be considered for these words is to put their modern equivalent in the margin, NOT IN THE TEXT! If these words are changed in the text then accuracy must be sacrificed, and this would be a terrible mistake. No person with a sixth grade education (or even less) will have any problem reading and understanding the *King James Version* if he wants to (John 7:17). The so-called "archaic language" problem is no problem at all for anyone who wants to know the truth. As we will see in the next chapter, it was for the most part invented by the publishers and translators of the new "Bibles" to help justify their version's existence. They not only change the words, but also the TEXT behind the words, weakening many essential truths. The readers of them pay a high price for "readability."

Its Honesty Concerning The Apocrypha

Another tactic the enemies of the *Authorized Version* use to try and intimidate the Bible believer is the matter concerning the *Apocrypha*. The (Old Testament) Apocrypha is fourteen books, most written before the time of Christ, that are NOT scripture and NOT part of the canon. The word "apocrypha" itself means, "*not genuine; spurious; counterfeit*," the definition of the word declares the nature of the books. Since the first edition of the *King James Version* had the Apocrypha BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS, critics will cast doubt on its integrity by smugly saying to the Bible believer, "The original edition of the *King James Version* had the Apocrypha in it and all fundamentalists agree that it is not God's word; therefore, your Bible is flawed...." They say this like they expect the believer to immediately abandon his Bible and fall at their feet and say, "Teach me master." That the enemies of our precious Bible would bring up the Apocrypha at all shows the extent they will go to, to get rid of the hated *King James Version*. And as we will see, it is also an act of the utmost hypocrisy.

It is true the 1611 edition of the *King James Version* had the Apocrypha in it, but as we mentioned, it was *between the testaments*. Furthermore, the translators plainly labeled the books as "apocrypha" (remember the definition). They never once hinted that they considered any of it scripture; on the contrary, they left the reader in no doubt that they knew it NOT to be scripture. No one at that time considered it to be

scripture anyway except the Roman Catholics. If one will look at a 1611 edition of the *Authorized Version* (or a replica of it), he will find the translators clearly identified the fourteen books as "the books called apocrypha" in the table of contents, separating it from both the Old and New Testaments. Also, at the end of Malachi, they add the words "The End Of The Prophets" to show the END of the Old Testament. On the next page the Apocrypha begins, with the word "Apocrypha" (remember the definition) in large letters in the upper center of the page and twice more in smaller letters at the top. The word is also found *twice* at the top of every page thereafter. At the end of Second Maccabees (the last book), the words "The End Of The Apocrypha" are found. On the facing page the New Testament begins.

Here, the question arises, Why did the translators put it in if they didn't believe it was scripture? Simple, the same reason many Bibles have references, notes, and commentary in them, for *recommended reading*. The Apocrypha is of value if only from a historical standpoint, and the translators put it in the first edition for that reason. In the later editions it was removed.

One can see in this matter even more clearly than in others that the *Authorized Version's* enemies will in an act of desperation not hesitate to bring up half-truths and partial information to try to destroy someone's faith in it. They allow a believer to assume the worst without telling him all the facts, and one fact they are careful to omit is that their "Bibles" contain the Apocrypha also, not in the English text, but in the "oldest and best Greek texts"!

The two texts which are the basis for nearly all of the new translations *both contain the Apocrypha WITHIN THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE!* *Vaticanus* contains Apocrypha in the Old Testament, and *Sinaiticus* contains some in the New Testament. The copiers of these corrupt manuscripts made *no distinction* between the canon of scripture (66 books) and the Apocrypha. To them there was no difference. The texts the *King James* translators used DID NOT have these phony books in them. See the hypocrisy? The critics make a charge they know to be false against the *King James*, while keeping quiet the fact that their "best texts" contain the very same WITHIN THE CANON! How dishonest, deceitful, and unethical can people get? If the *Authorized Version* is not authoritative because it contained the Apocrypha in one edition between the testaments, what does this have to say about their favorite GREEK texts? By their own argument they have much less authority! Beware, Christian, the forces at work trying to destroy your confidence in your precious Bible will stop at nothing to advance their cause.

The Agreement Of Its Different Editions

The edition of the *King James Version* in common use today is slightly different from the 1611 edition and Bible critics often use this information in an attempt to intimidate and confuse Bible believers. They usually resort to this approach in a final act of desperation. When a critic cannot shake a believer's faith in the *Authorized Version* with his usual arguments, and more than that, the believer has pointed out how these arguments are based on unbelief, he must do something to protect his precious ego. The final assault may be something like, "Which revision of the *King James Version* do you believe is infallible anyway? You do know that the Bible you have in your hands is not the 1611 edition, don't you? Why, the *King James Version* has been revised four (or six, or eight) times since 1611, resulting in 20,000 (or 25,000, or 30,000) changes between then and now. So which one is infallible, they can't all be?" This evidently is supposed to shock the believer into submission and cause him to join the ranks of the "unbelievers," but when the matter is honestly dealt with it is clear this argument is just more "hot air."

The *Authorized King James Version 1611 Bible* has NOT gone through one true revision (many of the new "Bibles" claim to be a revision, but this is a fraud as we will see later), however, it has gone through several different *editions*. The most notable editions were in the years 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769. There were many changes made in these editions, but they were not of the nature the critics insinuate when they pull their "revision hoax." They would have the believer to believe that since there were a large number of changes made, the text of the *Authorized Version* we have today is drastically different from the 1611 edition. This is a deception of the most diabolical sort. The current edition of the King James Version (not the corrupt *New King James Version*), is, as far as the text is concerned, *IDENTICAL to the intended original edition*. In a report given to the American Bible Society in 1852 (well after the 1769 edition, which has been the standard edition ever since) a researcher states:

The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us UNALTERED in respect to its text.

With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains UNCHANGED AND WITHOUT VARIATION FROM THE ORIGINAL COPY AS LEFT BY THE TRANSLATORS.

Since the TEXT of the *Authorized Version* we have today is virtually identical to the one the translators delivered to the printer, you may be wondering what kind of

changes were made that number in the thousands and cause such a ruckus. They fall under three categories:

- (1) A change in *typestyle*
- (2) changes in *spelling*
- (3) and corrected *typographical errors*

First, we will look at the change in typestyle. The first edition of the *Authorized Version* was printed in the *Gothic* typestyle. Gothic letters are formed to resemble handwritten manuscripts, thus they look quite different than the Roman letters which are in common use today. The printers used the Gothic typestyle because they considered it to be more majestic and beautiful than the others, but it is somewhat harder for people to read who are not used to it. One reason it is more difficult is because it transposes some of the letters of the alphabet. The Gothic letter "v" looks like a Roman "u," the "j" looks like today's "i," and sometimes the "s" looks like the modern "f." As a result, the word love is rendered "**loue**" in the 1611 edition, Jesus becomes "**Iefus**," and Christ looks like "**Chrif**." It is apparent how this ornamental typestyle could be confusing to some, but the printers only wanted to exalt God's word.

In 1612, an edition of the *Authorized Version* was printed using the Roman typestyle. Though it is less graceful and ornamental than the Gothic, it is easier for most people to read. Just the change in typestyle alone accounts for *thousands* of the changes between the 1611 edition and the later ones. As anyone can see, these changes do not affect the TEXT of the *King James Version* in any way, no more than a self-pronouncing text does (there is no difference in the meaning or hearing of the words), but many will allow you to believe otherwise

Spelling changes account for nearly all the remaining differences between the editions. In the early seventeenth century spelling had not yet become standardized; it was left to the whim and fancy of the author. Many times an author would spell the same word differently, even in the same book. Even Sir Walter Raleigh sometimes spelled his last name "Rauley." The King James translators were consistent with spelling in their version, but, still yet, the way they spelled many words then is different than the way we spell them today. Often, an additional "e" was placed at the end of words, i.e. "doore," "feare," "loude," "worde," etc.; and double vowels were more frequent; "bee," "doe," "hee," and "goe" are examples. Double consonants were more common too. Evil was spelled "euille," until was "vntill," and son was "sonne." Changes like this make up the majority of differences between the edition of 1611 and the edition we have today. They are not changes in the MEANINGS of the words at all, only in the spelling. See how deceptive the Bible critics are? They try to fool the

believer into thinking their TEXTUAL changes (*RSV, ASV, NIV, NKJV*, etc.) are justifiable because the *King James Version's* typeface and spelling were updated! Honesty does not appear to be a virtue among many of them.

The final category deals with the 400 or so changes made between the 1611 edition and today's that do affect the text. The critics make much of these changes, but every one of them was because of a *typographical error*. In the seventeenth century printing was a very tedious process. The typesetter had to set every letter by hand, and sometimes errors crept into the text as a result. Usually a letter was misplaced or the word order changed. Sometimes a singular was rendered a plural or vice versa, and rarely a word or two was omitted. Often these errors were not caught until after the book was printed. These type of errors are to be expected even with today's sophisticated printing process. Nearly every book, magazine, or newspaper printed today has at least one "typo" in it, and even recently printed Bibles occasionally have one.

Most of the typographical errors that were in the 1611 edition were corrected in the 1613 edition, but the 1613 edition introduced even others. In 1629, another edition was released that corrected these. Two of the original translators (Samuel Ward and John Bois) took part in making these corrections, and who would know the intent of the translators more than two of the translators themselves? However, a few more "typos" were made during this printing, and the 1638 edition removed these. By this time nearly 75 percent of the 400 textual variations had been corrected, the rest were picked up later.

Of the four major editions of the *Authorized Version*, the 1629 and 1638 were mainly to correct typographical errors; the 1762 and 1769 were to update the spelling. By 1769 whatever slight textual errors that still remained were removed, and the text was finally free from any man-made error.

We will list some of these "typos" below so the reader can see the nature of the changes and how this issue is blown way out of proportion by the Bible critics. We will first reproduce the 1611 reading, and then the present, corrected reading.

1. shall burnt them — shall burn them
2. sons nor daughter — sons nor daughters
3. shewed them by the prophets — hewed them by the prophets
4. that you remember me — that ye remember me
5. this thing — this thing also
6. requite good — requite me good
7. he came and worshiped him — he ran and worshiped him
8. chief rulers — chief ruler

9. a fiery furnace — a burning fiery furnace
10. now and ever — both now and ever
11. good — God
12. thy right doeth — thy right hand doeth

One can easily see from the above examples that the variations between the version of 1611 and the one today are very slight, thus ANY EDITION of the *Authorized Version* is *vastly superior* to any one of the new "Bibles," even if the new "Bible" is typographically perfect. Even with "**God**" rendered "good" (Psalm 69:32) in the 1611 edition, and "**of God**" omitted in the same (1 John 5:12), it is much to be preferred above any other English translation. As we have said, the promoters of the new versions use these slight typographical variations to justify their CHANGING of the TEXT, and the change is always for the worse. Below we will produce one example of this. The *New King James Version* claims to be the fifth revision of the 1611 *King James Version*, but one verse will show this to be a lie. We will look at Acts 4:27 as found in the true *King James Version*, and then the verse as it reads in the so-called *New King James Version*.

For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together. (KJV)

For truly against Your holy Servant Jesus, whom you anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together. (NKJV)

No edition of the true *King James Version* has the word "servant" in place of "**child**," yet the NKJV does. In this verse it agrees with all the other "new" versions and refuses to call Christ God's child. Of course, the scholars will say, "the Greek word can be translated as `servant.'" Yes it can, *but it can also be translated as "**child**,"* and this is what every true *King James Version* ever printed says. Dear reader, which exalts the Lord Jesus Christ the most, being called God's servant, or God's "**child**"? Which rendering would the Devil prefer? There are many more "revisions" of this type in the so-called NKJV, and each one takes something away from the truth of the text.

One writer estimates the number of changes between the NKJV and the true King James to be near 60,000, and these are nearly all changes in the text! With only 400 textual variations in 380 years, (and all of them "typos") in the real *King James Version*, do these people expect Christians to believe that their 60,000 changes are of the same fashion? Nonsense. Not one change made in any of the editions of the *Authorized Version* was to update the language or correct a (supposed)

mistranslation, so the revision claim promoted by the translators of the *NKJV* truly is a hoax.

Furthermore, many of the new translations that are based on the Alexandrian Greek text (*RV*, *ASV*, *RSV*, *NIV*, *NASV*, *NRSV*, etc.) claim to be revisions of the *Authorized Version* also. (It appears that the promoters of these "Bibles" are jealous of the results God has obtained through the *King James* since they are always comparing their versions with it or claiming to be a revision of it. Also, by this they are admitting that the *King James* is the standard their version is to be judged by.) Their translators would have you think that since the typestyle, spelling, and "typos" have been updated or removed from the *Authorized Version*, that this gives them license to completely change the underlying GREEK text! The text used by these Alexandrian "perversions" is different from the "*Textus Receptus*" the *King James* translators used in over 5000 places! This is the height of deception. How could anyone honestly claim that these versions are revisions of the *Authorized Version* when they come from a entirely different text? God has blessed, honored, and promoted every edition of the *King James Version*, "typos" and all, but he has NOT these. As was mentioned before, the *RV* is out of print (or nearly so), and the other new "Bibles" must be advertised heavily to even look respectable beside the blessed *King James*

Textus Receptus or King James?

In the last few years, many leading fundamentalists have changed their position on the *Textus Receptus*. Thirty years ago (around 1960) the majority of them insisted the Alexandrian type of manuscripts (*Vaticanus and Sinaiticus*) were the "oldest and best Greek texts" and maintained the English translations that came from them were superior to those made from the *Textus Receptus* (then only the *King James*). Since then, many of these "authorities" have shifted their allegiance to the *Textus Receptus* (or *Majority Text*), claiming it is "closest to the original." The result of this change is the publication of the *New King James Version* in 1982. It is based on the *Received Text*.

Why did these scholars do this? What possibly could have affected them to make them change their position so drastically? Did the manuscripts change? Did the *Majority Text* in some mysterious way lose its "errors"?

Apparently, these men just could not endure the stigma of being branded as Bible correctors and members of the "Alexandrian cult" by Bible believers. They found themselves being identified with translations that omitted hundreds of words, mistranslated many key passages, and weakened every fundamental Christian doctrine

(especially those dealing with Christ), and evidently the "heat" was more than they could take. They didn't want their reputation to suffer in the eyes of the public because of their position, so they gradually began to accept *Receptus* readings and finally published the *NKJV* as an "improved" *King James Version*.

Is this change in "preference" any improvement? Not at all. Their basic premise and ideology has not changed in the least. They still do not believe ANY Bible is inerrant. Not the *Textus Receptus*, the *Majority Text*, or even the *NKJV*. They simply shifted their preference to remain "fundamental" in the eyes of ignorant Christians.

We are mentioning this so the believer will not be fooled into thinking that someone who claims to be a "Textus Receptus man" or "Majority Text man" instead of a "Alexandrian" is a Bible believer. These people are just as much humanists in their attitude toward the scriptures as members of the "Alexandrian cult." They may now "prefer" the *Textus Receptus*, but they reserve the right to correct it, or any translation from it, whenever their final authority (opinion) tells them to. They still insist "only the original manuscripts were inspired," and "no translation can be inspired."

A Bible believer does not believe the *Received Text* (which was written in what is now a dead language) to be his final authority. He believes the Bible God has given him in his OWN language; the Book God put His stamp of approval on by using it to save countless more sinners than He saved with the *Textus Receptus* alone (or the original autographs)—the Authorized Version of 1611.

We should mention here that the *King James Version* is NOT a word for word translation of the *Textus Receptus* or of the *Majority Text*. It is based on the *Textus Receptus*, but it also has a few readings from other sources. God, in His providence, directed the translators in choosing which readings to use.

The Bible God Uses

Another compelling reason the *King James Version* is to be preferred above every other English translation is because it is the Bible God has used more than any other to bring the lost to Christ. In the last 380 years there have been nearly one billion copies of the *Authorized Version* printed in some form, much more than all other versions combined, and this alone says a great deal. Some may say this is an unfair comparison since it is so much older than the newer versions, but this is not necessarily true. The *King James Bible* has completely replaced the six major English

versions that preceded it, and as for the newer versions, they were all published *after* English became the universal language and *after* the earth's population had greatly increased. Still yet, to get the sales of these new "Bibles" to their present level the publishers had to resort to worldly advertising practices; the *King James Version* has prevailed because the Holy Spirit advertises it.

One very significant way a person can know the *Authorized Version* is the Bible God uses is by looking at its "**fruits.**" Since the day the printer pulled the first copy from off the press in 1611, the *King James Version* has enjoyed Gods favor. He has used it not only to bring more souls into his Kingdom than any other Bible, but also to civilize and educate entire nations which were ignorant of Him and His ways. No Bible, in any other language, or at any other time (including the "original autographs"), can approach the results God has obtained through the *King James Version of 1611*. It is not only "the single most influential book ever published in the English language," *it is the single most influential book the world has ever seen!* You say, "These are a very broad claims." Yes they are, but each can easily be substantiated.

When the *King James Version* was published, England was a second-rate power in the world. It was not until after she took a stand against "popery" (notice how the translators call the Pope "*the man of sin*" in the dedicatory, something no modern version would dare say) and for the truth, that God began to expand her territory. He knew that wherever saved Englishmen went they would take their Bible with them. God blessed and cared for England because He wanted her to take His perfect word to the corners of the earth. This she has done.

After the *Authorized Version* was published, the great British Empire began to form. England (later Great Britain) came to control land masses dozens of times larger than the isle of Britain. At its height (during the 1800's), the empire controlled *one-fourth* of the earth's land area, and concerning the sea it was said, "Britannica rules the waves." Australia, India, Canada, America, and many other countries were once British colonies, and each one was introduced to her blessed Bible. As long as England honored and believed the *Authorized Version* God honored her, but when she began to abandon and replace it, God began to abandon her. After 1885 when the *RV* came out to replace the *Authorized Version*, England's empire began to crumble; today she is again a second-rate power. The same is happening to the United States before our eyes. Unless America abandons the scores of "new Bibles" (which profess to be "improvements" of the *Authorized Version*), and gets back to the book she was born under (KJV, 1776), she is doomed to destruction.

The *King James Version* has been the Bible behind every major revival in the English speaking world since its publication. Not only that, it has been translated into over 1000 other languages and dialects, and God has greatly used these also to bring revival to other nations. The great missionaries and evangelists of the past used it exclusively to convert the lost. *William Carey* (1761-1834), called "the father of modern missions," took the *Authorized Version* to India and labored forty-two years to translate it (or the Greek text behind it) into forty-four languages and dialects. God greatly blessed his efforts. *Adoniram Judson* (1788-1850) carried it across the sea to Burma and translated it into the difficult Burmese. When he arrived, there was not one believer on the island; after his death, there were over 200,000 natives recorded as Christians.

John Wesley (1703-1791), the great founder of Methodism, preached nearly 42,000 sermons and led tens of thousands to Christ in England with only a *King James Bible*. His friend *George Whitefield* (1714-1770) led many thousands more to the Lord in America with the same. God used these two men to start the famed "Great Awakening" of the eighteenth century. *Francis Asbury* (1745-1816), one of their contemporaries, carried the *Authorized Version* 175,000 miles throughout America in his saddlebags and saw even more thousands saved. *David Brainard* (1718-1747), with great difficulty brought it to the American Indian; *Jonathan Edwards* (1703-1758) used it to convict and melt the hardest of hearts. *Charles Finney* (1792-1875) started great revivals in many cities with it; *George Müller* (1805-1898) used it to build orphanages and save countless children. *Dwight L. Moody* (1837-1899) preached it to over fifty million people; *Charles Spurgeon* (1834-1892) preached it to millions more. We could go on and on. We could mention how God used the *Authorized Version* in the ministries of *R. A. Torrey*, *John Paton*, *Hudson Taylor*, *Peter Cartwright*, *Sam Jones*, *Billy Sunday*, *Lorenzo Dow*, *Christmas Evans*, *David Livingston* and many others, but space forbids that we dwell on this long. To my knowledge, everyone of these great men was saved under, called to preach under, and preached the *King James Version* of 1611. They all knew which Bible to believe and use.

Again, to all who are willing to honestly examine history it is obvious that God has used the *King James Version* of the Holy Bible *more than He has used any other in ANY language*. He has chosen it to save untold millions, increase godliness and morality, and turn whole nations from darkness unto light (while copies of the "original Greek" set on the back-burner of obscurity). It is God's Bible of choice. He will save a sinner with a new version, but He prefers to use the *Authorized Version*. Looking at the results of the new "Bibles" as compared to the *King James* should be proof enough. If the new versions are so much more accurate, readable, reliable, and trustworthy than the *King James* as they all claim, then

WHERE ARE THEIR FRUITS! If God can use a "flawed" and "corrupt" *King James Version* to do all it has done, the combined effort of these "revised and improved" versions should do MUCH more! It is evident they haven't. All together they don't have one-fourth of the fruits of the blessed *King James Version*.

God has obtained these outstanding results with the *Authorized Version* because of His providential guidance of the translators to choose the words He wanted the English speaking people to have. Furthermore, He will use these English words translated into other languages as much as He will the Greek or *Hebrew* words! The *Chinese, Burmese, Malayan, Indian, Japanese, African, Persian, Arabic*, and *Hebrew* Bibles came directly from the *King James*. One source says it had gone into 109 languages before 1880, and today it has gone into 1,578 languages in whole, or in part. Who would dare tamper with the Bible God has used and blessed so much but a fool? The old saying applies here, "If it's not broke, don't fix it!" If God has no problem with *King James Version* why should any man?

It is almost certain that the majority of English-speaking Christians alive today were led to Christ under the preaching of a *King James Bible*, yet sadly many of them have abandoned it for a modern version. Why would someone abandon the Bible that has blessed him so much with salvation? Why would a person forsake the very words that brought about his new birth (1 Peter 1:23)? This is like someone abandoning his mother! As illogical as it may seem, many believers have been beguiled into doing this. This indicates (as mentioned before) that there is a supernatural element involved—Satan. Satan has seen all too well how God has used the *Authorized Version* to take millions out of his kingdom, and he wants to stop this any way he can. If he cannot take the believer's Bible away by persecution, he will try talking him out of it by appealing to his pride and intellect. He has hundreds of "scholars" and preachers working in his behalf by saying there used to be a pure Bible but insisting that it does not exist today. All they have brought to Christianity is *apathy, laziness, confusion, and unbelief*. **"By their fruits ye shall know them."**

In this chapter we have covered several reasons why the *Authorized Version* is to be preferred above all others, but we still have the most important reason to examine. It should settle the matter in the mind of every Christian and convince him beyond any doubt whatsoever. This reason will be the topic of our final chapter.

Which Translation Should You *Trust*?

A Defense Of The Authorized King James Version Of 1611

Chapter V

by
Timothy S. Morton

Copyright © 1993, Timothy S. Morton, All Rights Reserved
All Scripture references and quotations (except where indicated) are from the
Authorized King James Bible

Contents

CHAPTER V

THE PREEMINENT PLACE IT GIVES TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

[The Deity Of Christ](#)

[1 TIMOTHY 3:16](#) [1 JOHN 5:7](#) [PHILLIPIANS 2:6](#) [LUKE 2:33](#) [MATTHEW 19:16-17](#) [JOHN 1:18](#)

[An Objection Considered](#) [Other Attacks](#) [Omissions](#) [Weakened Translations](#) [Final Considerations](#)

[Appendix](#)

[Bibliography](#)

The most powerful indication that the *King James Version* is the pure, inerrant word of God is how it speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this area, even more than in the

others, it blows the new "Bibles" to pieces. The *King James Version* exalts the Lord Jesus Christ to the highest level at every opportunity; it consistently exalts Him as much as the Greek text will allow while the new versions practice just the opposite. These "perversions" do not hesitate to question Christ's *deity, virgin birth, blood atonement, bodily resurrection, and ascension* in a number of places yet their publishers insist they are better Bibles. For a true Christian, who should love and exalt his Savior with all his being (Mark 12:30), these facts alone should cause him to question the integrity of these versions. Whenever his Savior's character or virtue is attacked in any form, every believer should realize that Satan must be in it somewhere (Genesis 3:15); and since ALL the new "Bibles" attack Christ's integrity in some manner, the saint should have no doubt about him being involved. One of the characteristics of the coming "**antichrist**" is he denies that Jesus Christ has "**come in the flesh**" (1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7). That is, he openly *denies His DEITY*. And to prepare the way for his arrival, Satan has used his influence to weaken this essential doctrine in ALL of the English translations published since 1885, making the antichrist's job much easier.

If this is mentioned to a promoter of one of the new "Bibles," he will usually go into a spasm and reply, "Our Bible does teach the deity of Christ, and furthermore, every one of the *fundamentals of the faith* can be found in it." It is true Christ's deity can be found in the new translations in *some places*, but in many of the most clear and important places it is absent. Satan knows he cannot *yet* destroy every reference to Christ's deity in these versions because they would then no longer resemble (imitate) a true Bible. He knows they must, at least, read something like a true Bible to sell. So, for the time being, he allows a few of the less obvious references to remain.

Concerning the above statement that all the fundamentals can be found in these "perversions," we answer, *so what?* Is all it takes for a book to be a Bible is that it contain the fundamentals in it *somewhere*? Why even a one page tract could qualify under this definition. No, dear believer, there is much more to the Bible than just five (or more) fundamentals. It contains ALL the WORDS God wants man to have, not just the fundamentals. The men who make such thoughtless statements really do not believe what they are saying anyway. It is just a pat answer designed to throw up a diversion so they can get away from the Bible believer without their ego being harmed. They very well know that the deity of Christ and the other fundamentals can be found in practically every English version, even those they do not approve. The Jehovah's Witnesses' "Bible" (*The New World Translation*) has ALL of them in it, but no fundamentalist would recommend it to anybody. The same is true concerning the

"Bibles" promoted by the Roman Catholics. Many "conservatives" rejected the *Revised Standard Version* when it came out because they considered it to be modernistic and unreliable, yet it contains all the fundamentals in it, too. Again, we see that personal opinion is the final authority of these scholars regardless of what they say.

In this chapter, primarily under the topic of the person and work of Christ, we are going to compare some of the readings of the new versions with the *King James Version*. This way the reader can see for himself the extent these versions have been corrupted and how the *Authorized Version* gives Christ the highest honor. Of the new translations we will mainly use the *NASV*, *NIV*, and *NKJV* in these comparisons because they are the most popular, and the readings in them are typical of the others.

The Deity Of Christ

That Satan would attack the deity of Christ should come as no surprise to a Christian. With the great number of cults that have emerged in the last 125 years, most vehemently denying Christ's deity, every believer should be fully aware of Satan's tactics of deception (2 Corinthians 2:11). One tactic every Christian should particularly note is that before any cult (that claims to be Christian) can teach its peculiar "doctrine," its members must have an authority to appeal to, and almost without exception this authority is a new Bible translation (often their own) or the true Bible (*KJV*) interpreted by a "prophetic" group or founder. If these false prophets want to "teach" that Christ is not God and other lies, they know the *King James Bible* unaltered will not support them; so to "legitimize" their doctrine, they are forced to either go to "the Greek" and change the English words to suit them, or translate an entirely new version. The Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons have done this as well as the Unitarians and Christian Scientists. That is, they must one way or another get rid of the hated *King James Version* because instead of aiding them, it is a hindrance. Many times, though, these cults will use one of the new Fundamentalist approved "Bibles" instead of the *King James*, to advance their heresies because these versions better support their doctrines (this will be documented later in this chapter).

(Furthermore, the same Devil who deceives lost people into joining cults such as these also deceives *born again Christians* into unknowingly joining another. Not a cult that denies the deity of Christ, but one that *denies the existence of an infallible Bible*. Like the members of the deity-denying cults, these believers were deceived by following

the opinions of men they felt had advanced knowledge or superior education instead of following the Bible. Christian, again, beware.)

Here you may ask, "What does this have to do with me? I believe in the deity of Christ." Very well, but where did you first learn this truth? From a new translation, or from a person preaching or teaching from the *King James Version*? If in the unlikely event it was from the preaching of a new version, where did the preacher first learn it? Almost certainly it was from the *Authorized Version*, either directly or indirectly.

The *King James Version* is the only English Bible still published that contains every true biblical reference to the deity of Jesus Christ (as well as every other truth God has for man). Partially because of this bold position, God "authorized" it over the years to become the standard, final authority for all Christian doctrine. During much of the last four centuries it was the only Bible most people knew; therefore, we believe it would be safe to say that the vast majority of Christians alive today first learned of Christ's deity by reading and believing it personally or by being taught by someone else who did. However, contrary to nature, many of these same people will abandon the Bible that taught them this precious truth for one that in many places denies it! This would be a great mystery if we did not know Satan was involved.

When confronted with this irrational behavior, many of these "defectors" may attempt to defend themselves by again insisting that they can find Christ's deity in their favorite modern version. Granted they can, but the reason they can is because they are LOOKING FOR IT! They learned from the Authorized Version that Christ is God, so they need to be able to find this stated in some way in their new "Bible." That is, they had the advantage of having this truth clearly presented to them from the *King James Version* and were convinced of its validity, but then, after being indoctrinated by modern "scholarship," they forsook it for a version that expresses the doctrine much weaker. If a person was completely isolated from any influence of the *Authorized Version* (to the delight of Satan and his cohorts), and all he had for a Bible was one of these new versions, it would become difficult for him to learn of Christ's deity. And with only a few more changes made, it would be *impossible* for him to learn it!

See the direction Satan is headed? If he can get rid of the *Authorized Version* by destroying the public's confidence in it with "scholarship" and replace it with versions that subtilty corrupt Christianity's most fundamental doctrines, he will clear the way for his "new age" religion and the worship of himself in the person of the "**beast**" (Revelation 13)! It is only because God has preserved his pure word in the *Authorized Version*, and that the Holy Spirit has bore witness to it through the centuries, that Satan has been held off as long as he has. Sadly to say, though, through the apathy, neglect, and lack of discernment of many Christians today, Satan is rapidly approaching his goal. Before he could succeed, he knew he had to destroy the

confidence many Christians have in the *King James Version* and get them to abandon it as the Holy Bible. Under the guise of "older and better texts," he has convinced millions of believers to do just that, tricking them into accepting "Bibles" which remove Christ's deity from the following passages:

1 TIMOTHY 3:16
"God was manifest in the flesh"

This passage declares the deity of Christ so plainly that Satan had to try to weaken it in some manner, and in all the new "Bibles" he has succeeded. The ASV, NASV, NIV, and all the other versions based on the *Alexandrian Text* will not allow **"God"** to be manifest in the flesh. They insist the word **"God"** is not in the "original" because it is not in the "oldest and best texts" and that the word should be "who" or "which." But we have heard this song before. How do they KNOW it is not in the original? They do not know because there is no original. Of the hundreds of Greek manuscripts that have this passage in them, no more than SIX say "who." The vast majority of them, some very ancient, read **"God"** as the *Authorized Version*. The NKJV also says **"God"** but not without casting doubt on it by stating "who" in a footnote. The corrupt texts which say "who" or "which" were obviously altered over fifteen centuries ago by people who hated the true reading (Origen, etc.). Inspired by their father Satan (John 8:44), they altered the correct word (**"God"**) to an incorrect word ("who") in an attempt to destroy one of the *plainest and most direct verses* in the Bible which declares Christ's deity. And because a few of these old texts remain, most of today's "textual authorities" will not hesitate at the expense of Christ to use them and continue this lie.

Furthermore, with **"God"** removed and "who" in its place, the verse does not make sense. Look at it in a new version. Who is "who"? The verse is vague and left open for anyone to insert his own idea of who "who" is. This is the way Satan likes it—*personal opinion the final authority*. Fundamentalists will insist the passage refers to Christ, which it does, but all it says then is Christ came in a body. With "God" removed, Christ does not have to be God. He could be an "angel" as some cults insist, or a lesser, created "god" as others claim. With the *King James Version* reading, however, there is no doubt, **"GOD was manifest in the flesh."**

Christian, who are you going to believe? Are you going to believe the testimony of the *Authorized Version* which God has honored and used for the last two thousand years and which exalts our Lord Jesus Christ to His proper position? Or are you going

to believe so-called scholars who will not allow the verse to exalt Him at all and whose "Bibles" God has practically ignored? **"By their fruits ye shall know them."**

1 JOHN 5:7

"For there are three that bear record in heaven"

Since this verse not only speaks of the deity of Christ but also plainly declares the doctrine of the Trinity, the Devil is twice as determined to get rid of it. His strategy in this case is to completely eliminate the whole verse from the text as "not original." All of the modern versions, except the *NKJV* (which again casts doubt in a footnote), have followed his lead and omitted it. Some of them even change the numbering of the verses around it so the reader cannot tell this precious verse is gone!

The excuse given for omitting it sounds plausible on the surface, but under examination it becomes apparent that it is not the reasoning of faith but of humanism. These "authorities" insist that because this verse has few Greek manuscripts to support it, it was not in the original text, but they have no proof for this. Some will even say it was not originally in any text and assert the reading was "invented" in the sixteenth century, but this is not true. It has been cited by several writers of the past, the earliest in 255 A.D. It is also found in nearly all the ancient Latin translations including the "Old Latin," which was translated no later than the second century.

Again, that this verse is rare in the Greek manuscripts does not PROVE it was not in the original autographs. You say, "Yes, but you cannot prove it was in them." True, I cannot, but neither can I or anyone else PROVE that John 3:16 (or any other verse) WAS in the original! This brings us back to the disease we mentioned earlier—*"originalitis."* These "scholars" are fanatically obsessed with manuscripts God has completely abandoned; manuscripts He clearly did NOT want preserved through the centuries. Again, a true Bible believer has the same attitude towards them as God does; hence he does not trust "scholarship" to provide him with a Bible, he trusts God! No, I cannot prove 1 John 5:7 WAS in the original autograph, *but I can PROVE it IS in the BIBLE!* I have a copy of it in my lap right now. Why is this verse in there? Because God WANTS it in there! And as we have said repeatedly before, this is the Bible God has used, is still using, and will continue to use by choice. If the God of Heaven cannot give man the very words He wants him to have, and preserve these words the way He wants to preserve them after He has promised to do so, then we have no sure basis to believe anything else He says! So what if this verse is not in the *"Majority Text,"* it is in the BIBLE, and this should be enough for any Christian who walks by faith and NOT by sight.

PHILLIPIANS 2:6
"thought it not robbery to be equal with God"

The perversions say, "did not consider equality with God something to be grasped" (*NKJV*) or something similar in this verse. Any careful reader can see that the *Authorized Version* magnifies Christ's deity while the imitators demean it. **"Thought it not robbery to be EQUAL with God"** shows that Christ did not consider He being God as taking anything away from God. The verse declares Him EQUAL with the Father! The *NKJV* and the others, however, greatly weaken this statement by saying that equality was not something worth grasping or striving for, like He is a lesser "god."

The reader should now be beginning to see a trend. Why is it that the translators of these new versions, almost without exception, chose a reading that demeans Christ over one that exalts Him. When they are confronted with more than one possible textual reading, or with various ways a word or passage can be translated, they nearly always choose the rendering that lessens Christ. This is amazing. All of these translators claim to be Christians, yet when they translate a "Bible" they behave like they are not. One would think they would honor the One who saved them (if they are saved) by choosing the readings that exalt Him, but this is not the case. Even if the readings are found in the vast majority of Greek Texts (and nearly all are), they will abandon them for what they consider to be the "oldest and best texts" (the corrupt *Vaticanus and Sinaiticus* which contain the *Apocrypha* within the canon, see chapter 4). These men do not practice biblical principles in producing these versions, they follow the principles and mentality of worldly textual criticism. That is, they treat the Bible like it is just another historical book, attempting to recover it from the "sea of time." See how Satan has invaded the Seminaries and "Bible" schools with his natural reasoning? See how he has affected the thinking of the country's "most prominent scholars"? These "experts" go about their business of translating like God does not exist, or at least like He is unconcerned about His Son and His word. It appears they are motivated by purely human reasoning. Below are some more verses which show their bias against Christ.

LUKE 2:33
"Joseph and his mother"

Here, nearly all of the "perversions" state that Joseph was Jesus's father. They read, "the child's father and mother" (*NIV*) in place of **"Joseph and his mother."** The change is very subtle (Genesis 3:1), but also very destructive. Satan knows that if he

can weaken the verses which prove Christ's virgin birth it will make it easier for him to deceive people into thinking it is not true. And once he gets them to doubt this fundamental, he knows the others (deity, blood atonement, resurrection, etc.) will not be far behind. In some of the new versions Satan is much more blatant in his attack of this precious doctrine. The *RSV* says in Isaiah 7:14 that a "young woman" will give birth to a son, not a virgin, and the *Good News Version (Today's English Version)* removes "**virgin**" from eleven of the fourteen places it is found in the New Testament of the *King James Version*. See Luke 1:27 for an example. Again, it is obvious these changes are all for the worse.

Concerning Luke 2:33, the Bible correctors often try to defend their versions by saying, "Mary called Joseph Jesus' father in verse 48." Yes she did, but how could anyone miss how Jesus corrected her in the next verse! In verse 49 He says He was about His "**FATHER'S business**" in the temple! Joseph did not dwell in the temple, God did. Another difference between verse 33 and verse 48 is in who is speaking. Luke, the writer of this Gospel, who is also a medical doctor, says under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in verse 33 that Joseph is NOT Christ's father (if you have an *Authorized Version*) because he knows it to be a fact (Luke 1:1-4). Verse 48, however, contains an account of what *Mary* said at that time. She, of all people, knew that Joseph was NOT Jesus' real father, she likely referred to him as such publicly to protect them all from rumors (John 8:41). The majority of Greek texts again read with the *King James*.

MATTHEW 19:16-17 **"Why callest thou me good?"**

This passage is the victim of another vicious attack on Christ's deity. In the *Authorized Version* the rich young ruler calls Jesus "**Good Master**" and wants to know how to get eternal life. Jesus replies with, "**Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.**" The implications are clear. If Christ is good He is God because only God is good. The Lord wants the young man to see Him for who He really is—"God manifest in the flesh." This is much too plain for the new versions, they all butcher the passage up until His deity cannot be found. We will use the *NIV* as an example.

First, in verse 16, this "corruption" removes "**Good**" from "**Good Master**" and then makes "**Master**," "teacher". In verse 17 it makes the question read "Why do you ask me about what is good?" And as if this were not enough, it removes "**God**" from the

verse also, making it say "there is only One who is good." These changes take the attention away from who Jesus Christ is and put it on a young man's philosophical question about good works. Jesus said, "**Why callest thou ME good**" in the real Bible; the imitators say He was only referring to good works. A typical Satanic approach. The Devil would much rather someone look *atthemselves and their "good works"* than look at Jesus Christ and their sins. There are scores of other places in the new versions like this. They make changes that appear slight on the surface, but when one looks at them a little closer, he finds that they either question, corrupt, or destroy some truth God wants His people to have. Let the reader beware.

JOHN 1:18 **"only begotten Son"**

Though there are many more changes in the new translations which cast doubt on Christ's deity (such as removing "**Lord**" out of many verses in reference to Him, Mark 9:24; Luke 23:42 etc.; changing "**Son of God**" to "Son of man," John 9:35; calling the "**judgment seat of Christ**" the "judgment seat of God," Romans 14:10-12; destroying a key reference to His omnipresence, John 3:13; not allowing His blood to be God's blood, Acts 20:28; etc.), we will only look at one more in detail.

The NASV (which is recommended by all the leading Christian schools) says in John 1:18 that Christ is "the only begotten God." Some claim that since Christ is called a "begotten God" in this verse it exalts Him, but they are deceived. There is only one other major version which has this reading in the text (many others have it in the footnotes); the NWT of the Jehovah's Witnesses. The NASV is recommended by ALL the leading Christian schools as a "thoroughly reliable text," and NWT is recommended by none of them, but both insist Jesus is a "begotten God." This is one of the most blatant lies Satan ever hatched.

If Christ is "the only begotten God, then the other "God" in the verse must NOT be "begotten." *This makes TWO gods.* There is no way around it. If one believes either of these two corruptions, the "begotten God" has explained the unbegotten God! This fits the Jehovah's Witnesses (and others) official doctrine perfectly. They do not believe Jesus Christ is the one true God manifest in the flesh, and they use this verse as a "proof-text" to promote this lie. The author has had them use this very verse in their "Bible" to try to convince him His Savior is a lesser, created "god." Thank God the real Bible says that Jesus is "**the only begotten SON,**" which eliminates the problem, but the tragedy is this cult could have just as easily used the fundamentalist approved NASV to teach this fallacy, and sometimes they do! They will use it in an

attempt to confuse a loyal "fundamentalist" who trusts "scholarship" as his final authority.

The Bible believer knows that there is only ONE true God and that He is manifest in three persons (1 John 5:7). The second person (the Word) came to earth as the only begotten Son (Psalm 2) of the first person (the Father) through the third person (the Holy Ghost, Luke 1:35). This preserves the integrity and unity of the scripture and allows Christ to retain his proper position as Jehovah.

The author has found that after being confronted with this two Gods heresy, some of the NASV promoters will take exception with this verse and say something like, "With all due respect to the great scholars who made this valuable translation, I choose to retain the reading **"only begotten Son"** in John 1:18...." Statements like this further prove what we have mentioned repeatedly before, there is no book or collection of books in any language anywhere on earth that these men will allow to be their final authority. When "push comes to shove," they will always resort to the only authority they fully trust—their own *MIND*.

For a fresh breath of relief from the corruptions we have just waded through, the reader is encouraged to read Acts 7:59 in the *King James Version*. There he will find an instance where the translators showed their true motives and their love for Christ and His deity. The word **"God"** in this verse is in italics, and since this means it is not in the Greek, it shows they added it so the verse would make sense. They could have chosen another, less emphatic word (as nearly all of the new versions have done), but they chose **"God"** to leave the reader in no doubt that they believed when Stephen was calling upon the **"Lord Jesus,"** he was calling upon God.

We have only looked (and briefly at that) at six verses in the modern versions that attack the deity of Christ. And though there are several more, these should be enough to show the reader the attitude these new "Bibles" have towards the Lord and the direction "scholarship" is going. The *King James* scholars preserved the correct readings in their Bible, exalting Christ to His proper place, but every major version published since has tried to bring Him down. This fact alone should be enough to convince any Christian of the superiority of the *Authorized Version*.

An Objection Considered

After hearing a Bible believer claim that the *King James Version* exalts the Lord Jesus Christ more than any modern version, some of the promoters of these new versions may insist that their "Bibles" express Christ's deity more clearly in two or three passages. They contend in these verses the *Authorized Version* is obscure.

One of the verses they like to produce as "proof" is 2 Peter 1:1 (the others are usually 2 Thessalonians 1:12 and Titus 2:13). In this verse the *NKJV* and *NIV* change the placement of the word "**our**" to make the verse read "...of our God and Savior Jesus Christ" where the *Authorized Version* says "**...of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.**" Contrary to their charge the *King James* is not obscure here at all. The deity of Christ is found here as it is found in many other passages which link God and Christ in such manner. Take 1 Timothy 1:1 for instance, here we find "**...of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ.**" Does this verse refuse to allow the "**Lord Jesus Christ**" to be "our Saviour"? Of course not. Does the way it is worded not permit "**God**" to be "**Lord**"? Again, no. Does the verse refuse to allow Christ to be "**God**"? For the third time, no.

This verse, as 2 Peter 1:1, contains a figure of speech known as a "*hendiady*." It is a common occurrence in the scriptures. It is defined (by Bullinger, *Companion Bible*) as "two for one" or "two words used, but one thing meant." That is, the Holy Spirit uses two words or statements to refer to one thing or person. The second statement (often connected to the first with "and") does NOT add another person or object but only *adds information to, or states in another way*, the first. Zechariah 9:9 gives two examples of this. The "**daughter of Zion**" and "**daughter of Jerusalem**" in this verse is NOT two different daughters, the second statement is just another way of stating the first. This verse ends with another hendiady, "**...and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass**" (see Matthew 21:5). Does this mean Christ rode upon TWO asses at once? Don't be silly (Luke 19:35). The two statements speak of one object, the "**foal of an ass**" (second statement) is "**an ass**" (first statement) also!

One reason 1 Peter 1:1 is worded the way it is in the *King James Bible* is because of this figure of speech. The second statement "**...and our Lord Jesus Christ**" simply adds more information to the first, "**the righteousness of God.**" It declares Jesus Christ "God" and also speaks of Him as "**the righteousness of God**" (Romans 10:1-4)! As for the placement of the word "**our**," the *King James* translators were merely following the writing style of Peter (and the Holy Spirit) as found in the rest of the epistle. "**Our**" is not once found before "**God**," but it is often found before "**Lord**," "**Christ**," or "**Jesus**" (see 1:2,8,11,16, etc.).

The *Authorized Version* remains vindicated. It clearly elevates the Lord Jesus Christ more than any new translation.

Other Attacks upon Christ and His Work

Not being content with only attacking His deity, the new versions insist upon attacking Christ in other areas also, His *blood atonement* being one. The Lord's blood

atonement for sin is one of the most precious and fundamental truths in the scriptures. His blood (which is God's blood, Acts 20:28) was the actual ransom paid for the believer's redemption from sin and Satan's kingdom (Romans 3:24-25; Hebrews 9:12). No wonder the Devil wants to remove this vital doctrine from the Bible, it is the means of escape from his captivity. Nearly all of the new translations reflect Satan's "anemia" because in Colossians 1:14 they completely remove **"through his blood"** from the verse. The fact that the reading is in the majority of manuscripts and has been honored by God for centuries in the Authorized Version evidently means nothing to the translators. They must cling to their "oldest and best" corruptions no matter what the cost.

The vile *Good News Bible (TEV)* removes **"blood"** from FOURTEEN verses (most of them dealing with Christ) and replaces it with "death," (Matthew 27:4; Acts 20:28; Romans 3:25, 5:9; Ephesians 1:7, 2:13; Colossians 1:20; Revelation 1:5, 5:9). These substitutions are a gross perversion of the scriptures. Instead of translating the Greek word for blood correctly, the translators slyly (and unethically) insert their **"private interpretation"** (2 Peter 1:20)—death. As anyone knows the words blood and death are not synonymous, they do not convey the same meaning. The Lord's supper in Matthew 26:26-28 clearly shows they are different. The **"bread"** represents Christ's body which died, and the **"fruit of the vine"** represents His blood which was shed **"for the remission of sins."** A person needs more than just Christ's death to save him, he also needs His blood. Satan is trying his best to keep this vital information from believers and also unbelievers.

Another doctrine the new versions attack is Christ's *ascension*. The NASV and some others will not allow the Lord to ascend into Heaven in Luke 24:51. The words **"carried up into heaven"** are omitted from the verse. This forces Luke to contradict himself. Luke said in Acts chapter one that the **"former treatise"** (gospel of Luke) he wrote was of **"all that Jesus began both to do and teach. Until the day in which he was taken up"** (vrs. 1-2), but the NASV will not allow Him to be taken up. It just says He departed. You may think that this is insignificant since the ascension can be found in other passages, but it is not. *No portion of the Bible is insignificant*. If a person allows only one word to be removed or changed in it he does not have all the words God has for him.

In the very next verse (Luke 24:52) many of these versions refuse to let the Lord be worshiped. The *King James* correctly says, **"and they worshiped him,"** but the perversions say, "they bowed down" or the like. That there is a difference between the readings is obvious, one can bow down to a person without worshiping him (see also

Matthew 20:20 in the *NKJV*). Again, notice how all of these changes are negative towards Christ. Every change is at His expense.

The *Authorized Version* expresses every fundamental Christian doctrine more often or more clearly than ANY of the modern versions; this fact alone should speak volumes to any Christian seeking the truth. While the new "Bibles" demean Christ in many key passages, the *King James* exalts Him at every opportunity. How much more evidence do you need (Matthew 3:17)?

Omissions

Do you know what Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14; Mark 7:16, 9:44, 9:46, 11:26, 15:28; Luke 17:36, 23:17, John 5:3-4, Acts 8:37, 15:34, 24:7, 28:29; and Romans 16:24 have in common in the NIV? THEY ARE NOT IN IT! All of the "Bibles" based on the Alexandrian text omit most or all of these verses under the guise they are "not in the originals." "**Yea hath God said.**" Remember how the serpent tricked Eve in the garden? His questioning of whether God really said what He said led Eve to SUBTRACT from what He did say! She subtracted the word "**freely**" (Genesis 3:2). Today Satan is still influencing people to do the same, though now they subtract hundreds of words. Every one of these omissions is a tragedy. For instance, read the account of the salvation of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts chapter eight while omitting verse 37. With this verse removed the passage becomes somewhat vague because his salvation appears to be based on baptism (works) instead of belief on Jesus Christ.

There are many other omissions in these "Bibles." Compare any new translation with the *King James Version* in the following verses for some examples, Matthew 6:13, 9:14, 11:23, 15:8, 16:3, 19:9, 20:7, 20:16, 20:22, 25:13, 27:35; Mark 6:11, 10:21, 13:14; Luke 1:28, 4:4, 4:8, 7:31, 8:43, 11:2-4, 22:31, 22:64, 23:38; John 1:27, 3:13, 3:15, 11:41, 16:16; etc. These verses contain only some of the omissions in the gospels alone, there are many more in the rest of the Bible! How could anyone think a "Bible" that took out so much of the Bible was a real Bible? Satan has a lot of people fooled.

This is not all. The *last twelve verses of Mark and a large portion of John chapter eight* are strongly questioned in these corruptions. The *NIV* separates Mark 16:9-20 from the rest of the chapter as not "reliable" and does the same with John 7:53-8:11. I suppose God must have been unable to keep His word pure from the intrusion of these passages for nearly eighteen centuries and had to wait for some "scholars" to come

along who were able correct this "unfortunate error." Nonsense! We know the readings are genuine because they are in the Bible! God has promised to preserve His word for every generation, so why would any Christian doubt that He has? So what if the "doctors" SAY these passages were not in the "original," they cannot PROVE it, and the fact they are in the Bible God has chosen to use for the last 380 years is evidence against them.

If people want to cheat themselves out of having all the words God wants them to have by believing these new translations, that is their business, but a true Bible believer wants EVERY WORD God has for him. That these modern corruptions sell for Bibles shows the sad state of Christianity today. You could not have fooled a New Testament Christian or even one in the early nineteenth century with this garbage for a minute. As soon as he saw all the changes, attacks against his Savior, and omissions, he would have rejected them as trash. But today this trash is the "preference" of millions.

Weakened Translations

A large book could be written showing how the new versions attack doctrines, confuse passages, and destroy cross-references by choosing weak or vague English words to translate the Hebrew and Greek words. This is not always the result of their using a corrupt text, many times the Hebrew or Greek word translated is the same word the King James translators translated. The new versions are just afraid to be as bold and emphatic.

For instance, nearly all of the new "highly reliable" versions would have us believe that NO ONE in the Old Testament had to worry about going to Hell. Why? *Because they do not mention Hell ANYWHERE in the Old Testament!* In them all who died, whether they were "righteous" or "wicked," went to "sheol" or the "grave." No wicked person was in danger of Hell. How convenient this would be for an evil person if it was true. No matter what his behavior is, he would go at death to the same place as the righteous. These versions are more like the Jehovah's Witnesses' NWT than they are like the King James. The word "**hell**" cannot be found anywhere in the NWT. It transliterates all of the Hebrew and Greek words instead of translating them. Though the "fundamentalist" approved versions do mention Hell a few times in the New Testament, (they have to, to appear as Bibles) they join with the Hell-denying (and Christ-denying) Jehovah's Witnesses in the Old.

For an example of this look at Psalm 9:17 in the NASV and NIV. In the *Authorized Version* the "**wicked are turned into HELL,**" but in these "perversions" the wicked

need not fear about Hell, they need only be concerned about "sheol" in one (*NASV*) and the "grave" in the other (*NIV*). See how the verse has been watered down? "Sheol" sounds like a much more pleasant place to go to than "**hell**" does. Every English-speaking person knows what the word "**hell**" means, but how many could define "sheol"? This is a very clever trick of Satan. Take an uncommon word, "sheol" (sheol is NOT an English word, it is a Hebrew word transliterated into English), and use it to replace a very familiar and well established word (Hell) under the pretense it is a more accurate rendering. "Sheol" is generally defined as "the unseen state" or "the unseen world of the dead," but ALL are in this state at death whether they are wicked or not, Likewise, *ALL go to the grave whether they are wicked or not*. These two corruptions (along with many others) have essentially destroyed this verse by eliminating a Hell for the wicked and those who ignore God. See also Psalm 16:10, 18:5, 55:15, 86:13, 116:3, 139:8; Proverbs 23:14; Isaiah 5:14, 14:9,15, etc.

The *King James* correctly shows the difference between the destination of the lost and saved by mentioning "**hell**" 31 times in the Old Testament, each occurrence a translation of "sheol." "Sheol" is also translated as "**grave**" and "**pit**" in the *Authorized Version*. This indicates that the translators carefully examined the context of each occurrence of the word and translated it accordingly. The new "Bibles" have both the saved and lost going to the same place, but the *Authorized Version* correctly sends the wicked to Hell.

As for the New Testament, most of the new versions only have the word "hell" in them from 13 to 15 times. The *King James*, however, has it 22 times. Obviously, someone is interested in removing this word from the Bible. If you do not know by now who it is you will never know. The *King James Version* mentions "**hell**" a total of 53 times, each occurrence giving the Bible believer information about the destination or dwelling place of the lost. The *NIV* mentions it a mere 14 times, cheating the believer (and the lost) out of 39 other occurrences which provide vital information. I am sure this pleases the "serpent" greatly.

For the sake of brevity, we will only look at a couple more of the numerous mistranslations found in the modern versions, both dealing with the word of God. Look at 2 Timothy 2:15 in the *NKJV* (or any of the others). The *Authorized Version* clearly says that a believer is to "**study...rightly dividing the word of truth**" to show himself "**approved unto God.**" The *NKJV*, however, knocks "**study**" right out of the verse and replaces it with "be diligent." It has removed the ONLY verse in the New Testament that commands a Christian to study the scriptures. Is there any doubt who is behind this? According to this version (and the others) a saint does not have to study the Bible to show himself approved, he only has to "be diligent" doing something. The *NIV* also destroys the latter part of the verse

by replacing "rightly dividing the word of truth" with "who correctly handles the truth," completely eliminating a reference stating the Bible has divisions. Two of the most essential practices a believer should be engaged in, *studying the scriptures and learning how to rightly divide them* cannot be found in any modern translation. No wonder many of today's churches are filled with ignorant Christians.

Again, take the *NKJV* and read 2 Corinthians 2:17. The translators had to change this verse because it exposes the very activity they are engaged in! The Authorized Version says, "**For we are not as many which CORRUPT the word of God...**," but the *NKJV* (and the others) replaces "**corrupt**" with "peddle" (or something similar). No edition of the true *King James Version* says "peddle." The result of this change is clear. One can peddle something for profit without corrupting it, but once it is corrupted it becomes impure. How well this describes the dozens of new translations Christians have had to wade through for decades—impure. They are corrupt "Bibles" that are peddled by "Bible" publishers.

Apparently, today's "Bible" publishers are more concerned with making money than they are with getting God's word out. How else can one explain a "new, more accurate, clearer," version coming on the market an average of one every two or three years? Does the English language change that drastically so quickly? Of course not, it all boils down to "**filthy lucre.**" If they were primarily concerned about getting the word out, they could print an edition of the Authorized Version with notes in the margin that explained any difficult word and not spend thousands of dollars publishing other translations. This edition could be sold for a very reasonable price because there would be no committees to form, translators to pay, or huge advertising campaigns to fund. But, believer, we are being unrealistic. What motivates "Bible" publishers is seemingly the same thing that motivates worldly publishers: *competition, sales, reputation, and PROFIT*. And if they have to "revise" (corrupt) the Bible to be "successful" and get ahead of the competition, then revise it they will.

Furthermore, since 1880 over one hundred new translations have been published, each claiming to "correct," "revise," "clear up," etc., all the "deficiencies" of one book (*AV*), yet NONE of these "improved" versions is considered inerrant by anyone. Their translators claim to be able to find ALL the "errors" in the *King James*, but they can't produce a "Bible" that is error free! With over one hundred attempts to their credit they *still don't have a PURE Bible*. What does this have to say about "scholarship"? Why would anyone follow such an inconsistent crowd? All of the evidence we have presented above should be proof enough that Bible corrupters are just as prevalent today as they were in Paul's day.

For some more examples of corruption in translating look at the following verses in the *NKJV* comparing them with the *Authorized Version*: Matthew 20:20; Romans

1:18,25; 1 Corinthians 1:22; Galatians 5:4; Philippians 3:8,21; 1 Thessalonians 5:22,23; 1 Timothy 6:5,10,20; James 5:16; Jude 24; etc. For some Old Testament examples examine the following verses in the *NIV*: Genesis 1:28, 6:4, 22:8, 24:22, 43:34, 49:1,4,10,18; Exodus 3:14, 12:1-5, 34:7; Numbers 14:29, 21:5, 33:52; Job 41:1; Psalm 9:17, 12:6-7, 19:1, 22:20,30; etc.

Final Considerations

Our purpose in this short book was to give the average Christian non-technical reasons to believe the *King James Version* is the pure, inerrant word of God. Whether the reader is a young believer trying to find the truth among all the different translations, or an older saint who just wants to examine our position, we hope this information will aid him in his endeavor.

Though there are more arguments we could present showing the nature and integrity of the *Authorized Version*, the information we have presented above should be enough to cause any Christian who has fallen for the "original autographs" and "oldest and best texts" pitch to reconsider his position. Most believers when they first get saved are inclined to trust the "experts" on issues they are ignorant about, and this is understandable, but just because someone is considered an expert does not mean he is one. Every Christian is instructed to **"search the scriptures"** and **"study"** to shew HIMSELF approved. This is so he can KNOW for himself what is truth and what is error. These matters are much too important to be left to the opinions of experts, especially when the experts contradict each other.

As we mentioned earlier, one does not have to be a Greek or Hebrew scholar to be able to determine the truth. God never intended for a "priest class" of elite scholars to have a lock on the words of life. He wants all of His children to have access to His pure word so they can learn about Him, love Him, obey Him, and grow in Him. Any saint who can read grade school English can do just that.

From an objective viewpoint, the position we hold concerning the *King James Version* is really the safest position a Christian could take. Suppose we are wrong in believing the *Authorized Version* is the pure, inerrant word of God, all God could charge us with in this regard is believing the Bible He has given us TOO MUCH! On the other hand, if the King James IS inerrant and God's absolute final authority in English, all who have rejected it as such will have to answer for NOT believing it (unbelief)! They will also have to explain why they believed NO Bible on earth was inerrant after God's promises to preserve His word. If Bible believers are wrong they will be judged for having too much faith in the *King James Version*; if the *King*

James critics are wrong they will be judged for *faithlessness, infidelity, and for sowing unbelief!* We choose to be associated with the former rather than the latter.

From the material above (and more like it) and the witness of the Holy Spirit, we are firmly convinced that any edition of the *Authorized King James Version of 1611* (apart from any typographical errors, of course) is God's pure, inerrant, infallible word; all other versions are inferior. We are convinced its English text of both the Old and New Testaments IS the very word of God and ALL the words God wants us to have. Unlike many Christians today, we HAVE an inerrant Bible which we can SEE, HANDLE, READ, STUDY, and CONSULT any time we wish. How unfortunate it is for those who have a "Bible" that is not inerrant, or believe in one that no longer exists.

Finally, even with the great amount of godly fruits God has brought about with the *Authorized Version*, we realize its critics will continue to mount charges against this blessed book. Because of this, we understand the *King James* is likely to become less and less used in this Laodicean age (Revelation 3:14), but this does not affect this blessed book's integrity whatsoever. God is in this precious book, more than He is in any other. And though Satan will continuously attempt to corrupt it, God will have it in all its purity, somewhere, for His faithful to read, learn from, love and enjoy. Do you *have* an inerrant Bible?

Appendix

A summary of the reasons a Christian should believe the *Authorized King James Version of 1611* is the pure, inerrant word of God and superior to all other English translations.

1. Because God promised to preserve His word pure for every generation, and the AV has more godly fruits and virtues than any other Bible, thus indicating IT is His pure word.
2. Because its English text is based on the *Textus Receptus* which essentially represents the majority of Greek texts.
3. Because its Greek text (and translations from it) is stained with the blood of countless Bible believing Christians who gave their life to protect it.
4. Because its Greek text was directly responsible for the *Protestant Reformation*.

5. Because of the time of its publication (1611); before the great movements of unbelief swept the world.
6. Because of the accuracy, vitality, and expressiveness of its language.
7. Because of the ability, character, and integrity of its translators.
8. Because of its internal consistency and honesty concerning its italics, the apocrypha, and its different editions.
9. Because of its lack of a commercial copyright.
10. Because it has greatly outsold all other English translations combined with over one billion copies printed.
11. Because of its remarkable endurance through the centuries against constant attacks and criticism from Christians and non-Christians.
12. Because over *one hundred* attempts to replace it have not succeeded.
13. Because of the inconsistent and emotional arguments of its critics and their refusal to believe any Bible in any language is inerrant.
14. Because it is the *standard* all the publishers and translators of the modern versions compare their "Bibles" against.
15. Because it is the Bible God used by choice to start every great revival since its publication, resulting in the salvation of millions.
16. Because of the *preeminent place* it gives to the Lord Jesus Christ; it exalts Him at every opportunity.
17. Because it expresses every Christian doctrine (especially the fundamentals) more often or more clearly than any modern version.
18. Because of the witness of the Holy Spirit and the power and influence it has over men, saint and sinner.
19. Because God "authorized" it to be the standard English Bible in the eyes of the public through most of the last four centuries.
20. Because of its use of chapter and verse markings, making it much easier to find and note passages.

21. Because no one has proven ONE error in it yet.

Bibliography

If the reader desires more in depth information concerning Bible issues, manuscript evidence, and the integrity of the King James Version, the following books are recommended.

1. David Otis Fuller, WHICH BIBLE.
2. Edward F. Hills, THE KING JAMES VERSION DEFENDED.
3. Edward F. Hills, BELIEVING BIBLE STUDY.
4. G. A. Riplinger, NEW AGE BIBLE VERSIONS.
5. William P. Grady, FINAL AUTHORITY.
6. Sam Gipp, THE ANSWER BOOK.
7. Sam Gipp, AN UNDERSTANDABLE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE.
8. Barry Burton, LET'S WEIGH THE EVIDENCE.
9. Jasper J. Ray, GOD WROTE ONLY ONE BIBLE.
10. E. L. Bynum, KING JAMES FANS.
11. Peter S. Ruckman, THE CHRISTIAN'S HANDBOOK OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE.
12. Peter S. Ruckman, THE CHRISTIAN'S HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP.
13. Peter S. Ruckman, PASTORAL EPISTLES.
14. John Burgon, THE TRADITIONAL TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
15. John Burgon, THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF MARK.
16. John Burgon, THE REVISION REVISED.
17. Alexander McClure, TRANSLATORS REVISITED.
18. Gustavus S. Paine, THE MEN BEHIND THE KING JAMES VERSION.
19. Herbert Evans, DEAR DR. JOHN, WHERE IS MY BIBLE?
20. Bruce D. Cummons, THE FOUNDATION AND AUTHORITY OF THE WORD OF GOD.
21. Perry F. Rockwood, GOD'S INSPIRED, PRESERVED BIBLE.

Most of these books may be obtained through: Bible Baptist Bookstore

PO Box 7135 Pensacola, FL 32534